JESUS, THE CHRIST, IN THE LIGHT OF PSYCHOLOGY

G. STANLEY HALL

BS2421
.H17
v.2

JESUS, THE CHRIST, IN THE LIGHT OF PSYCHOLOGY

VOL. II

Books by the Same Author

Adolescence

Aspects of Child Life and Education

Aspects of German Culture

Educational Problems

Founders of Modern Psychology

Youth, Its Education, Regimen and Hygiene

JESUS, THE CHRIST, IN THE LIGHT OF PSYCHOLOGY

BY

G. STANLEY HALL, Ph.D., LL.D.

Professor of Psychology, President of Clark University



JUN 6 1917

VOLUME II

GARDEN CITY NEW YORK
DOUBLEDAY, PAGE & COMPANY
1917

Copyright, 1917, by
DOUBLEDAY, PAGE & COMPANY

All rights reserved, including that of translation into foreign languages, including the Scandinavian

CONTENTS

VOLUME II

CHAPTER		PAGE
VI.	MESSIANITY, SONSHIP, AND THE KINGDOM	326
VII.	JESUS' ESCHATOLOGY, HIS INNER CHARACTER, PURPOSE, AND WORK	392
VIII.	JESUS' ETHICS AND PRAYER	471
IX.	THE PARABLES OF JESUS	517
X.	THE MIRACLES	592
XI.	DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS	677

JESUS, THE CHRIST, IN THE LIGHT OF PSYCHOLOGY

VOL. II

CHAPTER SIX

MESSIANITY, SONSHIP, AND THE KINGDOM

I. Messianism among primitive people—Different views among the Hebrews—How Jesus came to believe himself the Messiah, and his original interpretation of the idea as he grew into the rôle—II. His achievement in coming to regard himself as the Son of God—The development of Yahveh and the kind of Deity he had grown to be in Jesus' day—The unique time and circumstance for the development of the theanthropic consciousness—Deity as ontological—Outcrops of this idea among children, primitive races, and its relation to Mana theories, and the development of a sense of fatherhood—In what respect sonship was involved in Messianity—How it transcended it—God as the race-soul—III. The Kingdom as the third great achievement of Jesus—Views of Kalthoff, Weisse, and others—Contradictions in Jesus' characterizations of the Kingdom and their explanation—In what sense it was of this earth and how far transcendent—The myths of primitive paradises—The Kingdom as inward—Stages by which Jesus came to realize that he must die—The value and proof of the idea of genetic stages—What it means psychologically to find God—Jesus' sociological ideas—Psychologic effects of the conviction that the end was at hand—The "second coming"—Kenosis.

I. *Messianity.* W. D. Wallis[1] in a very interesting study of the Messiahs of primitive people, shows us that in times of hardship from any source a great deliverer is expected. The claimant to this function must have qualities sometimes pretty carefully defined, and by fasting, vision, the interpretation of omens and oracles, he must demonstrate excessive spirituality. He must and does often heal the sick. If once accepted by the tribe, his soul becomes the embodiment of their collective soul, and he may acquire almost supreme authority. He can cause the tribe to migrate, to dispose of its goods, to perform very exceptional ceremonies, take great risks, undergo great sufferings; but if he fails he is at once discredited and often slain. In about every great crisis of history of the North American Indians some medicine

[1] "Individual Initiative and Social Compulsion." *Amer. Anthropol.*, Oct.-Dec., 1915. He has also allowed me to see a much fuller manuscript study of Messiahs.

man, and occasionally more than one, comes forward to rally his people to save themselves, to better the present customs or restore the old ones, to expel the oppressor, etc. The Messiahs interpret the old traditions as Jesus did prophecy. They point to an ideal state of restoration, and it is they that have caused nearly all the outbreaks so justly dreaded by their neighbours. Such Messiahs were Popé among the Tewas in 1675 and Tenskwatawa, a Shawnee warrior in 1805, who began his Messianic career in a trance and was thought to have brought his people a new revelation from the Master of life. He denounced the witchcraft and medicine of his tribe, the firewater of the whites, demanded more respect of parents and ancestors. Smohalla among the Nez Percé found the higher power and brought his tribe the sacred message that they should have strong and sudden help. Kanakuk among the Kickapoos was another mouthpiece of the Great Spirit to rescue his tribe. Flourishing tribes that do not feel the outside pressure of civilization have little need of redemption. The Navajos, e. g., rejected such gospel messengers. The Apaches, Delawares, Ojibways, Kiowas, have responded in some cases with intense vigour to such Messianic appeals. The first record we have in this country is in the seventeenth century when the Pueblos expelled the Spaniards. The Sioux were infected by the same fervour in the form of a ghost-dance. Among the aborigines of this country there are far more failures than successes, and the latter have greatly solidified the tribe. Similar phenomena have been found among the South American Indians, in South Africa, and among the Kalmucks. China so well knows these phenomena that it requires all incarnate gods in the empire to register, and "forbids the gods on the register to be reborn anywhere but in Tibet," fearing warlike results very much as Herod did. Among the Jews there have been various Messianic uprisings, not only against the foreign yoke but against the upper classes, and there are many features in the career of Jeanne d' Arc that illustrate the same principle. Some compare the relation between the Messianic religion and the national life with that between the brain and heart. The prophet very often cajoles his people with promises of an ideal state of things after a period of hardship and tribulation; buffalo will come back; game of all kinds will abound. The cry is generally to restore the old ways and customs, but perhaps in an idealized form. Some convince their followers that they perform mighty nature miracles. Occasionally a time is set for

the sudden and divine inauguration of a new state of things, generally to the disaster of the tribe when the prophet's direction is implicitly followed. In 1889-90 a wave of intense Messianic excitement swept through several Southern States among the negroes, and a number of self-announced Christs arose and wrought miracles. They received many gifts, predicted the day of the end, appointed a place to which many came on that date to await the great transformation. Such phenomena have a generic identity with the Messianism represented by Jesus, Mohammed, the Mahdi, and many others.

These phenomena raise the question which was first elevated to importance by the school of Durkheim, viz., as to whether in such phenomena the individual or the group leads. Very many phenomena connected with the various Mana theories now seem to indicate that the most primitive phenomenon is a sense of one great unifying principle which springs out of the collective soul when tribes celebrate together, in which case the soul of the individual is completely submerged in that of his community. Messianic phenomena, however, would seem to indicate that it is the individual that influences the group. He strives to take into himself the social mind of his community, and mould and guide it, for without him the group would be blind and dumb. The group makes the Messiah possible, but in him scattered rays, too dim to be otherwise effective, are focussed, and although his power is wholly psychic, it may become hardly less complete than that of the soul over the body. In Messianity we have, then, the most perfect of all paradigms of the relation between leader and led. Each creates and depends upon the other. In no psychologically essential aspect did Scriptural Messianity differ from that of a more primitive type. In the former, however, the phenomena are far more clearly wrought out and more adequately recorded, and especially the efforts of the Messiah are given a higher spiritual interpretation, which rises far above the material or political sphere in which the cruder forms of Messianism find their field of interpretation. Wallis sums up by saying, "The social seems merely a polarity or a dimension in which personality finds meaning and by which it is conditioned in its expression." Social influences are responsible for the ability of the leader to grasp their meaning, and each is equally creative of the other.

In addition to 456 passages in the Old Testament, Edersheim collected 558 in the Talmud and Targums referring to the Messiah.

Stanton collects 400 references in the New Testament to as many passages in the Old, which together he thinks define the entire career of the Messiah from his preëxistence in heaven to his resumption of a place in the Trinity at God's right hand after the Resurrection. Some of these are very explicit in detail. If the Old Testament passages are prescriptions they leave little room for freedom. His life had been written beforehand, and Jesus in assuming Messianity had simply to assemble the specifications from their many places and contexts and order his life with fidelity to these old oracles. From this point of view we should have to regard him as a studious compiler, diligently seeking cues and conscientiously following them as his rule of life. We might conceive that at some stage he realized how many circumstances in his past conformed to these rubrics, and from that point he took his life in hand to make the rest of it conform more perfectly. Thus many a savage ruler is moulded by prescriptions that define all his *Tun* and *Haben*, his *licet* and *non licet*, and later accepts for himself these taboos and exacting customs that may make a king's life a burden with constant fear of transgression. Some of these requirements happily are very generic, but they range from the most trivial points of etiquette to fundamentals.

On the other hand, we may conceive that all these correspondences between the new and the old dispensation hardly entered Jesus' mind. He may have lived out his life with little thought of what was or was not proper for a Messiah, and most of this texture of cross-references between his career and the sacred books of the Jews may have been woven later by dull dogmatic or Judaizing followers. Neither Paul nor the synoptists entirely ceased being Jews in becoming Christians, and they at least sought to keep every way open from the old to the new dispensation, as the patristic and even scholastic authors later sought to harmonize the classics with new Christian ideals. So the New Testament writers felt it necessary to amalgamate Jesus' *aperçus* with the prophets, psalmists, and historians. Thus we may conceive what occurred somewhat as follows: The original reporters of the New Testament story had been profoundly inspired by Jesus' reverence for the prophets and his luminous interpretation, which made them glow with novel meanings. They were loyal to him and to them, but realized how he sublimated their lessons till they almost transcended their own narrow ken. He had thus legitimized himself to them as a

re-revealer and transvaluator of the old writings. He was the Theseus who had drawn the sword of the spirit from the old sacred tree of knowledge, the Ulysses who had demonstrated his legitimacy by bending the bow of Hercules. So one of the chief impressions he made upon them was as *the* master of prophecy. He could bring out its ravishing music. It spoke to him as it spoke to no other. Its books had been more or less sealed but he became their great opener, as if he were the one to whom they had really been addressed across the centuries. As their latent content now shone forth, his hearers had been spellbound, overwhelmed with a deep sense that all the prophetic idealism would be realized and transferred from the realm of poetry to that of fact. They were thrilled by anticipating the early fruition of the old dreams of a long-deferred hope. *The* day had dawned, and expectation was on tiptoe as he talked.

But high meanings tend to fade, especially from minds on a lower level. To a mental vision that could see only dimly, these glorious insights were hazy and deformed, and as the years passed his followers became more incompetent to do full justice to them, so that a process of transvaluation downward into psychic equivalents of a lower order began. When at last the New Testament writers sought to set it all down we have the transformations characteristic under such circumstances, that are only now coming to be understood. Some phrases persisted and others were obliterated. Thoughts of Jesus lost their precision, for they had always been more felt than understood, and so the Evangelists had to strive to meet their task by a cy pres modification, if all unconsciously, of what Jesus exactly had said into the nearest psychokinetic equivalents possible to their minds. These took the form of general and specific, often very crass, correlations between the incidents of Jesus' life and teaching and prophecy, but on the lower plane of place and incident. The true interpretation of prophecy as here and now fulfilled, then came to expression in their representation of compulsion to conform to the vaticinations of old "that Scripture might be fulfilled." The tendency to find or make conformity was strong. It might be limited to trivialities like entering Jerusalem on an ass or dividing the garments by lot, or to larger matters like the virgin birth, Davidic pedigree, flight to Egypt, slaughter of the Innocents, appearance in the temple; but it warped the real historicity of all that pertained to Jesus. This apperception mass or complex in

the minds of the Evangelists would tend to make them more or less alert to all in their memories or in the traditions that conformed to this function, but negligent of all that diverged from it. This process began in the years immediately following Jesus' death, during which the *rapprochement* between the Messiah of the Old and the Jesus of the New Testament was growing toward a more complete identification. It is significant that the logia and also the primitive Mark and John show far less effort to unify the two than do the synoptists. If this be true, our problem is one of restoration, and is difficult.

The problem of Jesus' Messianity, although one of the most unique and difficult, is not unsolvable. Since Wellhausen's "History of Israel" (1878) it has been realized, as never before, that the most remarkable product of the Hebrew mind is found in the sixteen Books of the Prophets. The future was the stronghold of Jewish patriotism, the asylum of all its thwarted or delayed hopes, the ark of Israelitic expectation. The interpretation of the future was the chief field of whatever literature and social philosophy then existed. Poetry sang of it, history pointed to it, belief in a just God depended on it. It eclipsed not only the past but the present in interest. It was the refuge of defeated souls. Other races had believed in a golden age, and even placed it in the future, as Pfleiderer has shown. The Egyptians thought the great phoenix was to appear and change all. The Greeks realized that Pan was dead and a new world-power about to take the helm. The Roman augurs believed the present period drawing to a close. But it was the speciality of the Jews to establish a great national bank of the future and to make very heavy drafts upon it. From Amos to Obadiah they had expected another dispensation with such fervour that the present was made more or less provisional. It was, of course, variously interpreted; perhaps merely the present wrongs would be righted, or it was a poetic revelling in a land flowing with milk and honey where there was no war, sin, or sickness, and perennial spring, a new paradise, no labour or mourning. Again, it was expressed in measured denunciations and threats of a *dies irae*, as awful as human depravity had become hopeless, or yet again in mere penitential moods of humiliation. Some emphasized the judgment motive, and thought the new reign would be inaugurated by a great assize, meting out rewards and punishments. Some thought physical nature was to be remade. Others thought it would be heralded by worse tribulations

than any ever before known. Elijah would appear; the nations of the earth would war upon the chosen ones, who would only after unutterable suffering conquer, gather the dispersed, and rebuild Jerusalem under a greater ruler than David. Slowly, as Schürer has shown, some of these different interpretations were more or less curriculized in the popular consciousness and in sequent order, but the Hebrew mind grew protensive and from Abraham on lived more and more on promises, as they had done in Egypt and the wilderness, because they were Children of the Covenant. The idea of the new order of things was so inebriating that many feeble minds had become insane, and excitable ones expected a speedy catastrophe. Some wondered why it was so long delayed, but all who were dissatisfied looked for a restoration. There can be no doubt that the Messianic ideals of the people were very different from those of the prophets. But religious consciousness in this race was proleptic. Despite all the learning lavished upon this subject we do not know the extent of this faith among the Jews at the time of Christ, how many held it, with what intensity, when it was to come, how long it was to last, how it was to be ushered in, its ethnic or geographic extent. However this be, there are a few psychodynamic laws that apply to it, as follows:

1. It followed the law of inverse relation between the immanent and transcendent. When the kingdom of David and Solomon was at the height of its splendour, the faith in the spiritual Jerusalem grew dim. But when the national hearth became cold or when the people fell into captivity or under the Roman rule, it became more real as a refuge of irrepressible Semitic optimism. The Messianic belief was the form which national faith in God's justice and omnipotence took. It was an insurance policy, which if clung to would make up for all loss and deficit. This whiprow relation of reciprocity between the real and the ideal, which appears in a more adumbrated way in the history of other nations as well as in individuals, was also seen in the proclivity of the Jews to fall into idolatry in the days of prosperity, but when adversity came to turn to the living God. By this same principle sickness weans from earth and raises man's thoughts to heaven.

2. Ideas of historic continuity, developed in some directions, were in others strangely lacking among the Jews. Creation was epochal. A new period began with the Flood, another with Abraham, another

with the captivity, another with the exodus, another with the establishment in the promised land. Miracles like the destruction of Sodom and of the armies of Sennacherib and Pharaoh gave new turns to events, so the *status quo* was tentative like the short tenures of the year of jubilee. Thus the idea of dispensations, perhaps separated by transforming events, gave a catastrophic trait to the Hebrew consciousness, although some continued to believe that the reign of the Messiah would steal over the world unobserved, perhaps from some obscure quarter, and very gradually leaven the heart and transform life.

3. Characterological differences predisposed to different ideas of the Messianic rule; for the gross it would be sensual; for the refined spiritual; for the poor it would abound in gold and silver; for those hungry for God, knowledge of him would fill the earth; for those oppressed, compensation and retribution would be most prominent. Those of a spurty diathesis might interpret it as coming suddenly, while for others it would be a natural evolution. For visionaries it would stand forth with every detail with which the imagination can invest ideals, while for prosaic minds it remained a beautiful cloud-dream.

4. It might be very far or near. The competition with other national deities with whom Yahveh was brought into comparison by their conquerors tended to make him afar, because piety exalted him above them all. God had withdrawn, hid his face, his very name was secret. And although the Jews never gasped up into the inane by the Greek method of ecstasy, the Semitic fancy had long before peopled the hungry void between God and man with a series of intermediate beings, principalities, powers, angelic orders, and these also tended to keep God at a distance by themselves doing his work in the world. All the apocalyptic and eschatological conceptions were expressions of a consuming desire to bring God back to man, and such ethnic tension is a prayer which always answers itself.

5. The chief feature in the Messianic realm was ethical. God's justice was to be vindicated. The culmination of human affairs was not to be despair, nor was it formulated according to any program of pessimism save for the wicked. Nothing but good awaited the righteous. Thus optimism and pessimism were both true, one for the good and the other for the bad. The worse things were, the more radical would be the Messianic metamorphosis.

Precious concepts like these lay very close about the hearts of those Hebrews who were truest to the national ideal. Faith in some form of them was the essence of the highest religious life. They may have been held with peculiar intensity by a little circle of receptive waiting souls closest to Jesus. Perhaps the new realm might break out with dazzling brilliancy at the next Passover in Jerusalem. Any unusual event might be its signal to those conventicle brooders who kept themselves in a state of ideality. There can be little doubt that this was the chief culture atmosphere in which Jesus grew, and it is no wonder that it has suggested the most fruitful of all recent interpretations of Christology.

The most enlightened common sense now inclines to the view that Jesus lived out his early life completely under the influence of his environment, that his first conception of his Father's business was carpentering, that he had a completely natural development, and had known the Messianic ideals objectively long before he felt any special personal relation to them. We cannot agree with Lagarde that Jesus never thought himself the Messiah, nor with Holtzmann that it was merely a matter of ideality. But whenever he first conceived it with reference to himself it must have given him great pause. The modesty of one who does not yet know his genius would prompt him to hold back. Practical sagacity might suggest that the times were not ripe, or the difficulties were too great. It was not merely editing an old traditional story, as Goethe sought to embody the Faust legends or Sue those of the Wandering Jew. It was not assuming a title by performing some predetermined feat like that of Theseus or Siegfried. Nor was it merely playing a rôle to meet the popular expectations of the return of some great hero, nor a new sense of being an agent of fate or destiny. It was not working out a national task of reconstruction like those which Stein, Jahn, and Scharnhorst undertook for Germany after the Napoleonic wars, nor obeying the call of patriotism by harking back to ancient prophecy, as of a virgin deliverer in the days of Jeanne d'Arc. Neither was it the emergence of some great Mahatma from his obscurity, nor interpreting the mad ravings of the Pythian prophetess, or the whispering of the leaves of the Dodona oak. It has some analogues to all of these, but was vaster. It was impossible to fulfil any single interpretation of Messianity without disappointing others; and so lacking in coherence were even the canonical foregleams

of it that any detailed interpretation was sure to make more enemies than it could make friends. The great hope was not a prepared mould, like a Cinderella slipper, which the right individual would completely fit or fill. To realize it required the greatest perspicacity into the things of the soul, a genial creativeness, marking the advent of the successful artist or poet of poets in this domain, that should move in the midst of all this plastic material, like the spirit of God upon the pristine waters.

Of course we never shall exactly know how Jesus felt when he fully realized that the glorious nimbus of Messianity was within his reach. He was not intoxicated with it as many had been before, for it seems to have been a favourite form of paretic delusions of greatness. He did not put aside this thrice kingly crown because he saw dangers, for his pneumatic self perhaps urged him on by making him feel called to it. Perhaps he rather felt that he must justify not the assumption but the refusal of Messianity. Did he use it as a means for accomplishing other ends? Had he already grown so exactly into it that he would have been what he was apart from this conception, and merely found that it coincided with what he already was? Did it simply give him a higher form of self-knowledge because of the coincidence of objective ideal with subjective spontaneity? Was he more or less free, or was there a higher consciousness experienced or reflectively realized? Indeed, was there any distinct act of choice, resolve, decision, weighing results, or did the sense of Messianity grow in him unconsciously, even though the realization was sudden? Did all that was in him go up and out into Messianity and was his psychic legitimacy complete? Was this consciousness in its final form the exact expression of just what and all that he was by birth or heredity? Under the influence of this general expectancy did his nature expand further beyond the dimensions of mere prophethood than it would have done in another psychic environment, or was there any degree of accommodation?

All we can answer is that he did for the Old Testament Christology what, and more than, the higher criticism now seeks to do for Scripture, delivering its spirit from the bondage of its letter, not by scholarship but by a more vital psychological re-realization and revelation of its inner content. Perhaps Kähler is right, that what we really worship is not entirely the Jesus of the Gospels but the larger Christ of the whole Bible, of which Jesus gave us the germinal principle. Perhaps we

shall have to discuss with Nösgen whether the whole of Messianity found expression in Jesus so that the real kenosis is that this great ideal was in a sense self-pauperizing. If this be true, all those who advance the cause of Jesus are developing the hope of ancient Judea. Neither Buddha, Confucius, Mohammed, nor any other great religious creator had any such wealth of preformations or anticipations, and therefore no such culture momentum behind him. This prelusive ethnic hunger drew out the noblest aspirations, for it was a great ideal awaiting realization and beckoning to the heights of humanity. In this race, small, with limited notions of the great cosmos, and within a few years, a process of intensive greatness occurred which is the world's classic illustration of the power of the *religio pectoris* to supplement all defects of time, place, circumstance, and person by vision and idealism.

Jesus might have sought to realize Messianity in the high priesthood with its splendour and mediatorial function, with its great appeal to the imagination, but the priesthood was for Levites, and he was not of their tribe nor even a Pharisee but a layman. He was neither scholar nor theologian, and the atmosphere of legality repelled him. He might have chosen the prophetic rôle, usually at enmity with the hierarchy. The majestic figures of the prophets emerging from the desert, charged with spiritual messages like Zarathustra, especially at great crises, must have made a powerful appeal. Again, the rôle of the wonderworker was one of the most popular of all the attributes ascribed to the Messiah. The Jews never forgot what Yahveh did at Sinai, how Elijah drew down fire, and the sun obeyed Joshua. Nature was not yet tamed by laws, and all clamoured for a sign. This rôle was partly accepted by Jesus so far as he overcame man's greatest enemies, death and disease, although medicine was then exorcism and all nervous ailments were possession. Thus he fulfilled this type of expectation more than any of the others. The most insistent and common idea was that the Messiah should be a warrior king like Saul, and thus he had to be a son of David, so that his advent could be a royalist restoration. The dream of Jesus' age, as Holtzmann perhaps best puts it, was deliverance from an alien yoke and taxation, as Moses had delivered Israel from Pharaoh. This idea was most of all thwarted by Jesus, for his kingship was entirely inward.

What, then, was his interpretation? In a single word it was in wardness. The glorious triumphs of the Messiah must be realized in

the human soul. The new Jerusalem is the city of Mansoul. The law is all in the heart. This involution or subjectivization constituted the great work of Jesus in this domain. Never was anything done that assumed such depth, breadth, and capacity of the soul, or that was so calculated to magnify our timid narrow psychology. All the Messianic ideas have ample space for realization in the immanent domain of the human spirit. More than this, all history is worthless or valuable just in proportion as it is resolved into a typology of the processes that take place in that world which Kant taught us to call intelligible rather than empirical. Each man is prophet, priest, king, healer of himself. Compared to this inwardization Berkeley's subjectivization of the outer world is only a parody, as the magicians aped the miracles of Moses. As subject knows object only as a system of meanings, so Jewish history is transmuted into ethical and religious experience. Nothing ever implied such a high valuation of man's psychic power, and this greatly reinforced by transference the belief in immortality. Its echo is still heard in the ideals of the Church invisible, not made with hands, although all this an age like our own, so utterly absorbed in externals, is perhaps less able to comprehend than any other age.

This involved great transvaluation of values. Of this great reversal Buddha's renunciation is only the darker, sadder form. It is not easy to see how the poor are rich, or the rich poor, why the meek are proud, and the proud humble; how pain brings joy, the conquered conquer; how the vilest sinner may be purer than the perfect conventionalist. Only when we understand these things can we understand the sense in which Jesus realized Messianic hopes. This thesis of Jesus should appeal with peculiar force, but does not, to those psychologists who think meanly of the soul or deem it a mere epiphenomenon or mainly noetic, or nothing but a mirror or record of outer facts. Again, the great founder of the inner kingdom of faith gives us a culminating example of what every race should do for its history and ideals. He answers the question how races and ethnic stocks can remain perennially vital and growing, and escape the decay and death which have seemed to be the destiny of all the great nations of the past. Racial and national immortality are assured only by inwardly assimilating and interpreting on ever higher planes the earlier achievements and ideals of the race, by perpetually sublimating fact into meaning, using it as a symbol of higher future truths, ever trying to reproduce the his-

tory of the past but in a transfigured way, so that all that went before seems prophecy, and all that follows its fulfilment. Human records must have this incessant re-interpretation and re-revelation, just as human life is made more effective by it as we see, e. g., in Goethe. Either for lack of great minds or of incentives thereto this development has been arrested or there have been retrogression or so many dead and stagnant periods and so many dead nations. We have here a recipe of ever progressive growth and development for races.

Thus in realizing Messianity within, Jesus transcended individuality, and his soul became totemic of his race, the palladium of its ideals. In gathering this into himself he also diffused his self into the larger self of the gens and became its generalized type, so that his identity was expanded and merged into that of his people. All its good predicates became his. All that was significant in its history must be explained, at least symbolically, in his own life. But all this vastation of soul involved the beginning of a reversal of all the processes of incarnation. It was the doom of the body as the principle of individuation. As Plato conceived philosophy as love of death, so as Jesus' soul ceased to be individual and became racial, his body, which could not incorporate the race, must die, and the larger body, viz., the community—that is, the disciples, the elect, the Church—must take its place. The soul such as his had become needed a new and larger incarnation, not in one person but in a group. This reincarnation of soul he described figuratively as the Holy Spirit that could only come after his death, which was necessary to set it free, for the Spirit is only his soul freed from the body. Perhaps a better modern trope or simile of this process would be to call it a higher procreation which having borne and transmitted the immortal germ plasm, leaves the specialized soma to die because as an instrument it has done its work and so must be sloughed off like a husk which is of no further use and may become an encumbrance. Compared with the new, higher life his soul had kindled, his corporeity had become senescent and moribund. His psyche had outgrown his soma, and could not become a diffusive power in the disciples and their followers and successors while it was imprisoned in its sarcous tenement, so that in becoming the Messiah the thanatic processional had already begun. As others struggled to live, the struggle to die had now begun in the depths of his soul. Unique as this was, in him it is intelligible and not without analogies in human experience. The

sense of Messianity he described, not by calling himself the generic or ideal Jew or type-man, but by means of the more tropical and less exact phrase, Son of Man. He might have called himself the Father of Man, of a new type truest to the idea of humanity, or the best representative of the genus.

As Jesus grew into the Messianic idea his individual consciousness gradually passed into the larger consciousness of the group or race, and he eventually came to identify himself with it. He came to think, feel, and act in super-individual or genetic terms. He interpreted this supervening race-consciousness in himself ambiguously, partly as Godhead and partly as the Kingdom. Following the inveterate projective hypostatizing habit, he interpreted it on the one hand as his heavenly Father with whom he grew into unique oneness. This experience was the knell of his own personality, as distinct from and independent of the Father. Even his individuality, however perfect, could not express God, who as humanity itself transcends all limitations inherent in any single personality. On the other hand, the Johannin phrases expressing his relation to the Father, as we shall see, can be so arranged as to show every stage of progress from utter subordination to equality and identity until his individual ego, now entirely evacuated, marches on to death in order that the undiminished fulness of God may take its place. Thus he illustrates psychic euthanasia. God is Mansoul transcendentalized.[1]

II. *The Sonship.* A second great achievement was that Jesus grew to regard himself as Son of God. This was another experience not unique in kind but far transcending any other approximation to it in degree. This we must now consider.

Perhaps the most distinctive trait of Jesus' personality, the one that has always overtopped his teachings, is the fact that he believed himself to be and was thought by his followers to stand nearer than any other to God. This conviction was probably the most basal and deepest thing in his soul, and constituted his divine sonship. Harnack[2] declares that no psychology can ever tell us how Jesus attained this insight. Here, he says, research ceases, and this must forever remain a

[1] Of the voluminous literature on the subject see as convenient in English: V. H. Stanton: "The Jewish and Christian Messiah." 1886, 399 p. S. Mathews: "The Messianic Hope in the New Testament." New York, 1905, 338 p. E. Fiehm: "Messianic Prophecy." 1900, 356 p. C. H. Briggs: "Messianic Prophecy." 1895, 519 p. C. H. Cornill: "The Prophets of Israel." 1895, 193 p. J. M. P. Smith: "The Prophet and His Problem." 1916, 244 p. See also V. Völter: "Jesus der Menschensohn." 1914, 113 p. D. Carl Stange: "Das Frömmigkeitsideal der modernen Theologie." 1907, 32 p. F. Moerchen: "Die Psychologie der Heiligkeit." 1908, 47 p. See also his "Zur psychiatrischen Betrachtung des überlieferten Christusbildes," in *Monatsschrift für die kirchliche Praxis*. Oct., 1906.

[2] "Das Wesen des Christentums." 1901, 189 p.

mystery. This we cannot admit or believe. Were it so, the loss or absence of this knowledge would not only be unutterably sad but it would leave Christianity with a hiatus between itself and God, and also between itself and man, as a thing apart and dissociated, and therefore forever unintelligible and incredible. In fact, the sense of sonship was attained through a normal development of the *vita religiosa*, and although it occurred in the greatest psychic altitude, it was as natural as spring. True, Jesus kept no *journal intime*, and we cannot tell how much of this process was spontaneous unfoldment, impelled only by the nisus back of all development, and how much was the result of struggle, search, and victory. We find many of the same uncertainties as to the precise way in which he reached the sense of sonship, that we have seen exist concerning how he attained Messianity. Much, however, as we long for a fuller record of the hidden processes of his soul, it is not difficult to understand and even to indicate the psychogenetic stages that led him to conscious deity. To do this we must, however, first recall one of the considerations above that bore on the problem of Messianity, viz., that a race that does not produce great representative men and leaders at each stage of its development always suffers arrest and, in the end, degeneration. A race has been defined as a device of nature to produce one or more men of a high order. As its culture becomes richer, ever-increasing ability is needed for its guides. Because the demands for increasing superiority in fit leaders were not met in season, the great ethnic stocks of the past declined, like exotic plants that sprouted but could not bear fruit or even come to blossom. Again, outer forms, conventions, too much legality, external rites, encrusting internal meanings—these are like specialized somatic tissue which loses germinal power until the corpse is evolved. To such a condition Jesus as Messiah brought regeneration by subordinating form to content and becoming the unipersonal entelechy of his race, its higher monad or microcosm, entitled to speak with the voice of all the prophets at once, so that what had been phylogenetic processes now took in his person an ontogenetic form.

But what was the Hebrew deity whose son Jesus thought he became? Yahveh, at first the God of the Kenite tribe near Sinai, was as unique as were the Hebrews who adopted him, who chose him, or, as they always ascribed the initiative to the Divine, whom he had chosen. Each could say to the other in the phrase of the worshipper as in-

scribed on the Orphic tablets, "I am of thy race." He was essentially the God of the gens, and to each member of it he was his great clansman and kinsman, his personified ideal, destiny, genius. Originally regarded as hardly less awe-inspiring than the Akkadian Maskim from which some elements of his nature were derived, the mystic tetragram that stood for a name too sacred to be spoken suggested etymologically the lofty, strong, eternal one, and he was always associated in the Hebrew mind with the sublime and to them novel mountain phenomena at Sinai. Although the God of the ancestors, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, though not in a way that suggests, as some have thought, traces of the Spencer-Lange ancestor-worship theory of the origin of religion, and although long worshipped with offerings, there is little evidence that he ever sat at the table as the guest of his devotees or that sacrifices were ever made to him under either of the formulae, *do ut abias* or *do ut das*, phrases now sometimes used to distinguish between the earlier, e. g., pre-Dionysian, and the later Olympic religions in Greece. Yahveh was also both a battle-cry and a God of war. Once he had accepted human sacrifices. He had adopted many of the rites of the Canaanitic Baal, and had thus become also God of the soil and its fruits, and husband of the land, being always psychically consanguineous with his people. His worship was never domestic, and his sacrifices never on the hearths and altars of homes; but his culture was always a social rather than an individual, or even a family matter. Religion was not yet personal, but merely "the tie that binds."

From these very humble, not to say barbaric, beginnings, Yahveh grew in complexity and exaltation of character with the growth of the race, reflecting its most effective subjectivity, which came to be endowed not only with all the supreme ethical values but with independent objectivity. For primitive man and the folk-soul particularly, to know means to posit objectively, a tendency arising particularly from the irresistible ejective habit of sense perception. Races especially must project outward their most intimate nature to really know it, for what is man without an object? In religion differences between subject and object are most constantly changing. Kalthoff urges that the deeper we penetrate into this domain the more the subjective predominates over the objective. Yahveh became more than tribal, more than the embodiment of the moral ideas of the Hebrew stock. He

was the "essential truth of Jewish man." Hence, by the law of fission or bifurcation, the transcendent, which is always secondary, had emanated from the soul of the race. What the chosen people renounced for themselves in power, wisdom, and holiness, they not only ascribed to but enjoyed in their deity. He was one, because they were the pure, unmixed race; supreme, because they held themselves to be the best stirp in the world; just, because he embodied their conviction that good and evil would both be recompensed in this life. He was the celestial party to the great covenant; vindictive, yet judicious; jealous, but kindly; stern in discipline, but with a parental heart. To this personation of the higher life Abraham was called to devote himself with abandon. Some of the prophets gave Yahveh almost cosmic dimensions, and the Psalms made him not only Lord but Creator of nature. Yet he was a particularist, exacting in all matters of sacrifice and rites, and enforcing nice distinctions between what was *kodish* and taboo. His personality later became so multiplex that it was hard to define, and if he did not become merely a vinculum to include a larger number of attributes these were so distinct as to suggest henotheism among the qualities enshrined within his nature. He had not only chosen but trained his people by successes and calamities, fears and hopes. He had watched over them, and had always been on hand in emergencies with special deliverances. Thus the worship of Yahveh meant respect for the very highest ethnic conceptions and convictions.

We can see that the assumption of sonship to such a being, instead of being involved with and inseparable from the problem of Messianity, as Baldensperger, e. g., thinks it to be, would mark a distinct advance, although it would be a natural if not inevitable next step, if advance there was to be. As the Jews were children of Yahveh's choice, so Jesus as their type-man was his Son in a peculiar sense. As such, all the lavish care bestowed upon them by their Lord would converge and concentrate upon him as its focus. Jesus was the apical blossom for the sake of which the Divine Creator had so long watered, pruned, transplanted, and dug about the parent stem. He was chosen from among his race just as it had been chosen of old, so that he now stood in a position related to his kinsmen somewhat like theirs toward the gentiles. He was sacrosanct, or doubly set apart, as well as beloved, and this relation was most exactly conceived as filial. Thus no objective event (such as Peter's confession, the transfiguration, or the voice

from heaven) nor any pathological subjective experience led Jesus on to this momentous next step, but an ineluctable inner necessity which was genetic because it was an advanced stage of development along the line of his previous psychic growth. It was at the same time a logical conclusion from two premises. Yahveh is the Father of the Jews, and Jesus is their Messiah. Thus only one already consciously the Messiah could have become Son of God with any plenary conviction. This of course involved the utmost expansion and elevation of soul, and many new lines of spiritual development. Natural as it all was, and true to all we know of the higher psychology and anthropology, it was unique, as much so, indeed, as was the development of man on the monophyletic theory, which assumes that at only one particular point in time and place did the primitive man evolve out of the higher anthropoids. So this process could never have taken place in the world before, and we can hardly conceive it possible again.

For instance, the conviction of sonship could not have broken forth toward any deity that was not in many respects tribal. Again, no individual could normally grow into the sense of sonship, unique like that of Jesus, who had not already in a sense embodied his race in himself. That race, too, must be pure, its stock eugenic, persistent, ascendent. The conceptions of the cosmos had to be more or less narrow to make the process possible and also to give it depth and intensity. Just this deity, individual, race, moment, stage, had to concur. Thus the problem of sonship was reduced to its simplest and most favourable terms. If we delocalize or detemporize the process, or dissociate the solution from its historic environment, the understanding of it all will escape us. True, myth tells us of sons of God galore, that have sprung from the immortal descendants of heaven who consorted with the daughters of men, but the sonship of Jesus has nothing really in common with this, nor is his sonship procreative save in the above sense; so that the Immaculate Conception is only a symbol but of a distinctly different order, a figure of speech taken literally. Jesus' relations to his Father were purely spiritual and not spermatic. From every pragmatic point of view sonship did involve some reduction of Yahveh. We find in the New Testament no such magnificats of God as abound in the prophets, as a being infinite in time, space, and perfection, omnipresent, omnipotent, creating all things, awful and infinitely transcending human concepts.

Indeed, there is little left of the *numen tremendum* of Sinai, with all his plenitude of superhuman and supernatural predicates. Deity for Jesus is the still small voice of man. He brought the twilight of the Semite Yahveh, as God the Father passed over into the Son by whose generation his own being is diminished. Not that Jesus deliberately reduced the God-idea to make it coincide with his own personal consciousness; but he only felt that all possible revelation of him must henceforth be in human terms, and so he wished to make it as complete in his own person as possible.

The theanthropic consciousness, too, was attained under circumstances unprecedentedly favourable to the human race. Yahveh had become an essentially ethical being whose greatest love was for holiness, and whose deepest hate was for iniquity. This marked a complete accession of man to his Kingdom, for virtue is the most divine thing in the world. Man, indeed, cannot think too highly of this, his essential, truest ethical self. No other deity than that of the prophets could be incarnated in human form with more gain and less loss of attributes. This once attained, immense impulsion of soul would follow from an experience so new and so near the apex of the goal of human development. So pregnant a mystery would impel all who could feel it to strive to utter it by every crude trope available; to preserve as precious and to reiterate as rubrical; to elaborate into dogmatic, mystic, speculative form every phrase, image, or parable descriptive of the filial relationship. The sense of its intense significance would give the crassest of these experiences a certain degree of sacred inviolability. Thus it is no longer possible to believe that Jesus brought the theanthropic consciousness ready-made with him into the world or that it arose suddenly and completely at a particular stage like the baptism. Why the synoptists quietly assume but say so little about sonship, and why the great Johannin passages so indelibly stamped on the heart of Christendom are so incondite, confusing, and contradictory, are themselves facts that need explanation. It was of course far easier in an age of fable and miracle to substitute material for spiritual truth than to describe supreme new stages of psychic development. The Nativity and especially the Resurrection were dramatic sarcous scenes that seemed to give tangible demonstration of deity, and such crass literalisms are of course far more intelligible. The psychic fact that these symbols stood for was so lofty and difficult of comprehension

that the terms of man's previous experience were inadequate to express it, and therefore many clung to the stupendous physical miracle as one of the most available vehicles of expressing Jesus' mediatorial function. Masterpieces of ethnic pedagogic art as they were in their day, they still linger because their crudity of form and matter is so over-compensated by the sublimity of their content. Their very amorphousness and monstrosity, if taken literally, constitute a standing incitement to translate them up and back into the spiritual truth they stand for.

In view of this, it is not without psychological interest and significance to try to indicate the very scattered and confused references to Jesus' relations to his heavenly parent. Gathering them all together thus, and by the simple method of transferring the order of passages bearing on the subject so as to give them a certain possible historic sequence, we may arrange them to show stages as follows:

(1) First come the texts that suggest great subordination to the Father, akin to the first stages of childhood. Jesus is little, the Father all; the Father is greater than he; he does nothing of himself; he speaks as the Father taught; he is but a voice; even his words are not his, but his Father's; he tells what he has heard; he does as the Father commands, and can do nothing he does not see the Father do; his doctrine is not his; places in heaven are not his to give; he comes not of himself, but is sent; no man comes to him except the Father draw him; he is astonished that his hearers should not know that the doctrine is of God, and that he does not speak merely by himself; he finds satisfaction that he always does the things that please the Father; he has made known all the things he heard from him; he has declared and will continue to proclaim his name. In such expressions Jesus seems to be commissioned as a factor, agent, or envoy, and is far from being plenipotentiary. He has little personal power or discretion, but acts on pretty complete instructions. Thus any prophet might have spoken who had seen the Lord as the world had not. Such texts have been the arsenal of both the mystics and the heretics, who regard Jesus as distinctly inferior to the Father.

(2) At a somewhat more advanced stage of his sonship Jesus is given some authority, e. g., to execute judgment. He is not alone, but the Father is with him, or will give him what is asked in his name. Some are given him to keep, and he reports that none save one has been lost. In his valedictory prayer he says that he has finished the

work assigned to him, and recommits those given him to the Father. He prays not for the world, but only for those given him. Power has been delegated him over all flesh to confer eternal life upon those given him. Here he appears to have a sense of delegated power, sharply defined and limited, although it shows that the sense of sonship is developing toward maturity.

(3) To a perhaps next higher or more closely related stage belong the phrases in which the relation of the disciples to Jesus is compared to or identified with his to the Father. He loves them as the Father loves him. They are to keep his commandments and abide in his love, as he keeps the Father's commandments and abides in his love. He sends them into the world as he is sent. The glory given him he gives them. The love of the Father to him is to be in him and he in them. Those who confess, deny, receive, hate, or persecute his disciples, do the same to him, with the frequent intimation that those who do so to him do it to the Father also. The Father is to love them as he loves him. He is in the Father, and they in him. They that love him shall be beloved of the Father, and he will love them. "As I live by the Father so he that liveth in me, even he shall live by me." Without him they can do nothing, etc. Here his mediatorial function of middleman between God and his followers is attained and expressed. His relations to God are parallel to their relations to him. Although in the vine parables and other allusions there are differences, the nascent sonship-idea is so far throughout entirely psychic or adoptive with nothing about it involving natural paternity.

(4) Higher, and we may conceive later, comes a stage of parity, consubstantiality, equipollence, if not identity with the Father. All things that the Father hath are the Son's (Matt. ii:27) delivered to him of the Father, given into his hands. "All thine are mine, all mine are thine, I in thee and thou in me." When Philip would be shown the Father he is asked, "Have I been so long with you and you have not known *me?*" Those who keep his word the Father will love and "*we* will come and abide with him." Both will love those who love the Son. To know him is to know the Father. "All things that the Father hath are his," and, as if their functions were now reversed, "he shall take of mine and show it to you." Now he readily assigns to the disciples the places in heaven which he had before said in answer to the same request were not his to give (Matt. xix:28). Not only

does no man know who the Son is but the Father, and who the Father is but the Son, but the Son knows the Father even as the Father knows the Son. The Father is in him and he is in the Father. Before he had said that all that was asked in his name the Father would give, but now he says, "If you ask anything in my name *I* will do it." "Whoever loves me shall be loved by the Father and" (as if a climax) "I will love him." "Also these things they will do because they know not the Father nor me." Now to hate, love, receive, see, know the Father and the Son are one and the same act and state. In all this there is no trace of subordination, but, indeed, a few phrases in which the Son almost seems to take precedence.

(5) An implication, and perhaps also a last stage, is that of the transcendence of his own nature. These expressions seem prompted when the shadow of the cross first appears. He is to go hence and the disciples cannot tell whither. Soon they will see him no more. None asks him, "Whither goest thou?" Later, perhaps, he announces again and again that he goes to the Father. This should cause them to rejoice if they love him. Sometimes he promises to come again. Again, he goes to prepare them a place and will receive them unto himself but they cannot follow him now. When he next drinks the fruit of the vine it will be in the Father's kingdom. Thence he will send them the Comforter from the Father who will testify of him. Because he goes to the Father the world will be convinced of righteousness and, a causal sequence of the same event, the disciples shall do greater works than he. Even the dead shall hear his voice. As to his origin, the disciples are from beneath; he is from above. Then, at their entreaty, speaking more plainly than before he announces that he has proceeded forth from God. He loves them because they believe that he came out from God. He is to receive the glory that he had before the foundation of the world. He came forth from the Father into the world, and returns to God; he is himself the bread that came down from heaven. Here and in the preceding phase lie germs of the supernal birth, the Resurrection, and the Ascension, which seek to body forth in tangible form these exalted states of mind which historically not only preceded, but gave the initial psychic motivation to the *parousia* and all the post-mortem records, as well as later to even the Nativity.

Of course these stages must not be regarded as too sharply de-

marcated in time. They are rather degrees of nascency, the last more or less implicit in the first. Jesus' theanthropic consciousness, *Gottesbewusstsein*, lived, as it were, on a slope; and mood, recognition by others, favouring or adverse currents of outer events or inner states, impelled his soul now up, now down, this scale. At the Crucifixion the ebb of conviction sank to zero, as he felt forsaken of God as he was discredited and deserted by his friends. On the other hand, hostile critics have raised the question whether, had he lived to a good old age and achieved vast other successes, this sense of oneness with God might have grown to a dogmatic oraculism or megalomania. To such vain speculations it can only be answered that his faith seems to have had just the degree of intensity and elevation to give it maximal psychological efficiency as the *punctum saliens* of the new and epochal historical movement which it inaugurated. The very phrase, Son of God, is an artistic, anthropomorphic masterpiece, because it expresses correctly and in terms of the closest personal relation the best attitude of man toward God, and indeed by no means loses its appositeness even if the Father be conceived as impersonal. It means that the claimant of this title feels himself a child of the universe out of which he sprang, and has a filial attitude toward it. To attain and maintain this attitude it is not necessary to regard the cosmos animistically. What lies behind this, perhaps the most pregnant phrase in all the culture history of mankind?

Evolutionism did not begin with Darwin, but with the very early cosmogonies. Man has always been interested, not only in his human but in his cosmic pedigree. He has yearned to know in the language of one of the oldest Vedic hymns, "Whence, oh whence did this great creation spring?" Was it made or did it grow? In any case what was first or in the beginning, and how is man related to this? All ontologies from Parmenides to Hegel have grappled with the problem of man's ultimate derivation. Spinoza was "God-intoxicated," although his God was substance, knowable in only two of his perhaps numberless attributes. Mystics of all kinds, from Proclus and Plotinus to Boehme and Eckhart, have striven to come into contact with or immersed themselves in pure predicateless being. What was in the beginning has always been one of the most haunting of all questions that the world has addressed to thinking man, and it has had as many answers as there are mythic cycles, creeds, or systems. It has been

conceived as undifferentiated being, so highly generalized that no positive affirmation can be made without limiting it, so that it is little else but the substantive verb standing alone, without either subject or predicate, and tantamount to nothing. It is existence without quality. In this old ontological mould have been cast such conceptions as cosmic gas, the undifferentiated and unknowable. Or more anthropomorphically it has been called *nous*, *logos*, a reason, force, or energy conceived as will, with a developmental nisus behind it, or love has been the spring of all things. This great recessionary *Hang* or trend has of late been studied in two new fields, which show how its primordial and instinctive nature antedates the dawn of reason.

(1) The first is its prevalence among children,[1] who often lose themselves in cosmic emotion in the contemplation of infinities of time and space. This may become a dizzying obsession or neurosis. The soul is drawn heavenward in sky- and star-gazing, and may become almost agoraphobiac toward the blue vault above. The psychogeneticist sees in this phenomenon the germs of such cults as those of Varuna or Urania or Nirvana, and perhaps of the Yogi discipline. It is the pantheistic "impulse to return," the first effort to think *sub specie eternitatis*. It is the first naïve orientation toward the beginning and end of all things, a dim instinctive sense of a menstruum into which even personality will be resolved.

(2) Students of the mind of primitive races have within the last two decades found, especially in all our Indian tribes, who are best known, and among other primitive people, especially the Melanesians, cumulative traces of a stage of culture that preceded the animism which Tylor thought primitive. Although concerning these primitive conceptions scholars are by no means accordant, there is an agreement that we have here the undiscovered but very general stage through which the souls of perhaps all savages pass. On this view all men very early in the history of mankind had a deep, overmastering sense of some all-pervading power, variously called Mana, Orenda, Wakanda, etc., which is not the great spirit and which has probably no trace of personality in it. This power was before and back of all things, pervades them, and gives unity to the most diverse things in nature, for it is continuous and so cannot be broken. It brings all things to pass. It is an ancient, sacred, mysterious energy, that is supersensual and

[1] See my "Adolescence," Vol. 2, p. 159 *et seq.*

metaphysical. It is a subtle bond that gives all things a common life and makes them akin. It is also a bond of souls. Mana is felt chiefly in times of great social excitement and group activities which bring individuals into the closest touch with one another, as if the individual soul expanded into that of the entire tribe, and this expansion is prolonged until it feels itself to be continuous with the principle of life, and even with that of being itself. Some think Mana the source of magic power. Lovejoy thinks it is the first philosophy. Harrison[1] finds it pervading the religion of ancient Greece before Zeus, and compares it to Bergson's *durée réelle*. Durkheim[2] seems to conceive it as a kind of totem of the universe, and so does Marett.[3] It is a sense of oneness that seems to enter from without, and most agree that it is superpersonal.[4] Hocking[5] thinks it an ontological reminder of man's sense of dependence. It is only experienced in states of excitement and social solidarity. It has been defined as a sense of exceedingness or excessivity, or a kind of ecstasy, involving some surrender of the normal self. It brings with it a feeling of a larger, higher life, of elation and freedom as against personal limitation. A greater perfection is felt, etc. At first students of Mana thought that the conception of it was quite distinct both from the ontology of philosophy and from the haunting infinity psychosis of children, and yet deeper study shows the very close psychic analogies and equivalences of all three.

Moreover, every noetic quest, such as that for categories or innate ideas or forces, is motivated by the same propensity of the soul to get back to an abstract background of the universe. It was this deep trend in the human soul that made man so prone to accept modern evolutionism perhaps prematurely, and to presuppose its operation at points of the upward scale where it is as yet by no means established. In all these ways man has sought to strengthen the feeling of his own legitimacy as a true son of the cosmos, and this title makes him feel more at home in it. He yearns back toward the roots of things in order to feel that he is the heir of all the ages. His will loves to posit itself as a direct derivative of creative energy. He loves to think his sense of duty a categorical imperative, and also and especially that the

[1]Jane E. Harrison: "The Religion of Ancient Greece." London, 1906, 66 p.

[2]Émile Durkheim: "Les Formes Élémentaires de la Vie Religieuse, le Système Totémique en Australie." Paris, Alcan, 1912, 647 p. See also *L'Année Sociologique*.

[3]R. R. Marett: "The Threshold of Religion." London, Methuen, 1909, 173 p.

[4]Lucien Lévy-Bruhl: "Les fonctions mentales dans sociétés inférieures." Paris, Alcan, 1910, 461 p.

[5]W. E. Hocking: "The Meaning of God in Human Experience." New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1912, 586 p.

absolute lives and moves in his own heart and that his feelings, whether of dependence in Schleiermacher's sense, or of absolute freedom, as Hegel prefers, incorporate his intellect and his heart into the ultimate scheme of things. In all these ways the soul strives to feel itself one with the inmost nature of the world, and to realize that to be either the abject slave or the Supreme Lord of the universe are only ambivalent expressions of the same instinct of unity and solidarity with self, others, or the world.

Thus to personate all the sources of nature and mind, and to salute them all in one as "Our Father in heaven," as both the goal and end of all things, was a sublime achievement of pedagogic, pragmatic, humanistic genius. Each is the child of nature and of man, and therefore of God. Pure reason may soar to the absolute, but practical reason regards even being itself animistically, as parental, just as theology ascribes ontology as an attribute to God not inconsistent with his fatherhood. Our love to it seems reflected in its love of us. Man seems called to do its will because he made it according to his own. To know it is the highest self-knowledge, and therefore man anthropomorphizes the collective fundaments of things into a unity that seems personal, and in this world he is more at home as in a father's house made for him.

Thus, by identifying himself with God, Jesus went beyond Messianity by just so far as the God of the prophets transcended the Hebrew Messiah, and he also took another step toward death because deity as mankind in its totality is greater than any single individual can ever become. God was in him to an exceptional degree, but God cannot come to adequate and complete consciousness in any individual; and so, since God could not come to Jesus in all the plenitude of his attributes, Jesus had to go to God. In plainer and more modern terms, this means that if Jesus' realization had been complete that God was simply and only ideal humanity rather than a transcendent celestial person, and that man's universe were all of his own making, and if this conviction had also pervaded the minds of his followers, he need not have died, risen, and ascended, to document his sonship. These latter were a dramatization, necessary because of man's inability to accept Jesus' thesis of sonship unless his soul was thought to actually go up to the traditional abode of God. The fact which they symbolize is that he found, went to, and became the divine in his own soul.

He had to die, because men in the blindness of their hearts and minds could not believe that he had really found or become God unless he was thought to have divested himself of his body and gone up through space in ghostly and levitated form. Thus Jesus had to literally die and ascend to give a modulus or allegory of a successful quest for God. This was clung to as sacred because of the meaning it was dimly felt to embody.

Committed as Jesus was to the objective, hypostatized interpretation of God, and creative as was his designation of this concept as Father, many of the above Johannin passages show that he also revered the God within his own breast as a kind of collective term for the racial instincts, most of which slumber unrevealed in us all, throughout our entire lives. Hence we find a strange duality of interpretation in his mind. The Holy Spirit that was set free by his death and was in fact his soul, goes up to God in heaven, but it is also commissioned to dwell on earth in the souls of Jesus' followers, where it really belongs, although he bequeathed it to both them and God. Thus Jesus long hoped that his friends would understand the inwardness of his God-quest, and perhaps the beloved disciple was well on the way to do so. Therefore Jesus was reticent about it all, and shrank from promulgation, because he saw that crassly minded as most of the disciples were he could not make them realize that he had found God within, and that there was really no other way of doing so. To them the only successful quest of God would be to go to him above as one can do only after death. This he had to do, therefore, as a last resort, because worst came to worst, since the only God they knew was to be found at home only in the sky. Perhaps had there been time for a longer apprenticeship on the part of his followers, they might have understood without the tragic object-lesson which Jesus chose to give them at last, rather than that they should hopelessly fail to understand his divinity. Thus he gave an objective idolization of it which the Church has cherished as so central. But for this only mystic consciousness of the deep inner things of the soul, of which the death and Resurrection are only symbols, would his successors ever have confessed his divinity?

If the great sayings of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel as to his relations to the Father have any coherent and intelligible meaning, it is that the way to God is that which opens within the depths of the human soul. The true son of God reaches, communes, and unites

with him by mystic inner experience. Of this the laying aside of the body and the rising through space to a place are only symbols, even if the best and only ones. The star of the wise men, the opening heavens at the baptism, the reversal of gravity at the Ascension, the cloud that "received him out of their sight," suggesting absorption or melting into the empyrean, and all other astral references, as Voigt's careful study, "Die Geschichte Jesu und die Astrologie" (1911, 225 p.), suggested, are all to be taken tropically. God is not reached by a voice through space at any definite place, nor can we conceive Jesus returning to him by the same way by which he came down to earth to be born. This is all myth and symbol, although in the highest Platonic sense of these words, and hallowed as is all this imagery of the highest of all psychic processes. To rise to God is to enter the soul of the human race as a beneficent, discarnate, disembodied, superpersonal, diffusive power. This was the true assumption; for Uranotropism is really spiritual involution, and communion with God is the acme of communion with the larger racial soul within us. The absorption of Jesus' risen spirit into the cloud did not mean that he had left the world and man, but that he had completely entered them. It marked the consummation of his will to die in order to attain a more than personal immortality in the human race.[1] In the apocryphal Gospel of Peter (Chapter 5), Jesus is made to ascend directly from the cross, while in Chapter 9 the resurrected Jesus is of supernatural stature. If Jesus died as Messiah, his Resurrection and Ascension show him forth as Son of God. Here the two functions are perhaps most differentiated. If the former was historic, the latter is more Docetic, spiritual, plastic, poetic. Mere personality had ended, and with the Resurrection the soul of Jesus became henceforth incarnated in the community he founded.

The Jesus that arose and ascended was not a reanimated cadaver; so that the emptiness or tenancy of the tomb, so much discussed of late, is irrelevant. His body mouldered like ours. The post-mortem Jesus had no vestige of historicity, but was the most consummate of all the creations of humanity's wishes, hopes, and aspirations, the embodiment of his *ad astra per aspera* impulsions, the symbol of what we trust our future history is to be on to the end of time. Belief in it is the artistic interpretation of the yet-unspent momentum of human evolu-

[1]See my "Thanatophobia and Immortality," *Am. Jour. Psychol.*, Oct., 1915, p. 581 *et seq.* Also Lake: "The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1907, Chapter 7. Also N. Gill: "On the Intermediate State," Chapter 7.

tion, which in that day had to be conceived as apotheosis and divinitization; for man will become divine when he realizes not merely theoretically but in all his life the sense in which the Son of God is the son of man and will return to his father, man. Thus Jesus not only brought the twilight of the Yahveh of the prophets in reducing him to human dimensions, but made the beginning of those long processes the goal of which is the resumption of transcendent deity into immanent humanity. Thus the son of man will become father of the true God, and all things be given into his hands. This is now being accomplished in the Kingdom of the Son.

III. *The Kingdom.* And now how shall we conceive the Kingdom, the third great achievement of Jesus? Roughly we may say that it was a community in which his own Holy Spirit was reincarnated after his death, his heir, to which he bequeathed his soul. In it he began again a new (this time pluripersonal) life on earth. It was first the invisible and then became the visible Church. As the child is more generic and a better representative of the race than the adult, and so nearer God (as Jesus saw and said long before Wordsworth), so his own unique God-consciousness which was a growing, all-pervading sense of the genetic soul within him, came more and more to subtend the differences which separate individuals and to be not only genetic but generic. His divinity consisted in his ideal and eternal childhood, or in doing away with the threshold which separates the individual from the species in us. The child is father of the man he is to be, first because his traits are phyletically older than adulthood, which is a later addition or superstructure, and secondly, because he is a more generalized type from which the adult departs by the specialization and limitation involved in growth. More than the adult he is "human, and nothing human is foreign to him." Psychoanalysts never tire of insisting that the childlike is the unconscious, and *vice versa* (*das Kindliche ist das Unbewusste und das Unbewusste ist das Kindliche*). Thus Jesus is the eternally childlike (*das ewige Kindliche*) in us. In this consists his filial nature. He is God's own Son, for deity is intrinsic man's autistic nature. Jesus' personality differed from that of others by its plenitude of racial traits and in his ready access to this source of power. The ego must be minimized because over-individuation alienates from this divine well-spring of power. Jesus was not a philosopher of the subconscious, but its pragmatist, who first taught the use of and right

attitude to it. This made him a man of destiny, and gave unique momentum to his deeds and words. The high degree of affectivity often developed where injective and ejective tendencies of thought oscillate, as in the Johannin mysticism, is highly characteristic of the *vita religiosa* in which subject and object often become indistinguishable. It is hard to find an Aristotelian mean between medium Sludge and Nirvana or between oraculism and Vedanta.

This mean Jesus thought and found, not in any single personality, even in his own, but in a select group of persons which after his death grew in numbers and reached an unprecedented closeness of union one with another, surpassing even the friendship so lauded in classical antiquity, for the ties that bound his followers were closer even than any ties of family or blood. Each member sought, willed, loved, feared nothing for himself, but all things for the brethren. They were in Jesus. They were his body, and he was their soul. Community of goods was only one and not the chief expression of this new unison of soul. With such new ardour of fellowship it would be strange indeed if there were not occasionally agapistic perversions between the members one of another, and also of Christ. It is no wonder that the disciples lingered together and were loath to separate after the effusion of the Spirit. Kalthoff and his pupils think[1] that the figure of Jesus himself was created out of the heat and light of the new brotherly love. They deem primitive Christianity a gradual synthesis of Messianism, Stoicism, and various proletarian societies, and think that Jesus is only the personification of the ideas and experiences of the earliest groups of believers. His suffering and Resurrection are the martyrdom and revival of the early Church, and he never really lived. He was a fictive patron and founder of the Christian as some think Æsculapius was of the medical guilds. Every great movement of the folk-soul, according to Kalthoff, demands a personal ideal; and even if Jesus was an optical illusion, he was a necessary presupposition of the growing Church. Jesus embodied the psychic content of a movement that had to evolve a leader, and his figure, projected backward by the Evangelists, represents the aspirations and ideals of the infant community incarnated in its flesh. Each item in his life and teachings is meant to mirror

[1] A. Kalthoff: "Das Christusproblem; Grundlinien zu e. Sozialtheologie," 1902. "Die Entstehung des Christentums," 1904. "Was wissen wir von Jesus?" replying to Bousset, 1904. See also M. Maurenbrecher: "Von Nazareth nach Golgotha," 1909. Lublinski: "Die Entstehung des Christentums aus der antiken Kultur," 1910. Also "Falsche Beweise für die Existenz des Menschen Jesus," 1010. W. Schultz: "Dokumente der Gnosis," 1910.

some event in the nascent stages of the development of the Church, as similarly, post-exilic Judaism put back later ordinances as commandments given to Moses. Thus the commitment of the keys to Peter was put back from the later emergency in which it arose. We seem to get very close to a real individual heart in the Gospels, and this shows that it was a product of genuine literary ability natural enough after once the personal traits began to be given to the Christ-image. The freedom, idealism, and intense new enthusiasm of a group very sympathetically fused into a community could give an illusion of reality more compelling than history itself.[1] When we consider the psychological principle that fervid assent to a *traditio recepta* is only a lesser degree of the will to believe, which, if intensified, could create the tradition, we must construe Kalthoff's theory as illustrating only an exaggerated appreciation of the vitality of the new group-consciousness in which that of Jesus became incorporated and which took up and carried on his work of organizing the Kingdom on earth.

Besides being the perpetual repository of Jesus' soul two other facts were implicit in this, which made for the very highest ideality in the new community. The first was the immeasurable reinforcement of the belief in immortality, and the second was the conviction of a speedy end of all things. Both of these made for spirituality and inwardness. To live in daily expectation of judgment often made for purity, while the all-dominance of the next world over this and of the soul over the body exalted each above all material aims and all proximate ends and methods. The righteousness of the new Kingdom must be diffused to the farthest extent and in the least time, for the only real business of every one was to save his soul and that of others. In danger the herding instincts of all gregarious creatures culminate; and so the cofraternization of individuals who stood in unprecedentedly close relations to one another gave a unique solidarity not only between the individuals but between the different groups, however widely separated in race or rank. Solidarity of all the persons and all the groups one with another meant the unity of Christ's body in which his soul went marching on. They ate his body and drank his blood commensally as a symbol of oneness both with him and with one another.

Thus with the conviction, first, that he was indeed the Jewish

[1] J. Weiss: "Jesus von Nazareth, Mythus oder Geschichte." 1910, 171 p.

Messiah called to both reinterpret and realize that ideal, and second, that he was the son of Yahveh, in a very unique sense was also involved the third supreme affirmation, viz., of the Kingdom of God or of heaven. This was a community in which the new and higher life which he illustrated and taught was to be lived out. It appears, as we have seen, that the attainment of the Messianic consciousness dawned very early in Jesus' public career, and appears as a fixed assumption later; also that the sense of sonship which was involved in and yet distinct from it arose not long after, and was well established. Both these in some sense involved the Kingdom; but only after the shadow of death had fallen across Jesus' path did the details of it chiefly occupy his consciousness, so that only toward the last of his career were his conceptions of the Kingdom in a state of rapid evolution.

If we turn for a moment from Jesus' personal life and character, with the study of which the new Christology began, and consider him as a teacher, following in so doing the impulsion that prompted his disciples first of all to collect the logia, sayings, or words, which he had declared would survive heaven and earth and make each who kept them a rock, our first problem is to ask what was the central theme of his teaching; that is, how can it be most comprehensively characterized? In past decades we have had many opinions upon this subject. Fairbairn thought the divine fatherhood his focal concern; Titius conceived blessedness to be the root of it all; Julius Müller said it was sin; Rothe called it righteousness; Dorner held that the chief stress was laid on justification. But I think all those who carefully scrutinize the utterances at first hand must incline to the view, of late so strongly advocated by men of such diverse standards as Ritschl, Wendt, Lütgert and many others, that the most comprehensive characterization of his teaching is that it proclaims a new Kingdom of God or heaven or a new social state which is referred to in no less than 106 Gospel passages, only two of which are peculiar to John.[1]

Dissatisfied and confused by the voluminous recent literature on

[1]Confining ourselves first to the more explicit statements of Matthew in order concerning the Kingdom, we are told that the poor in spirit, also those persecuted for righteousness' sake, will possess it. Those who break the commandments are least, and those who do them greatest, in it. If our righteousness does not exceed that of the scribes we shall not enter. We must pray that it come, must seek it first, and all else will be added. Not all that call on the Lord can enter. It must be proclaimed. Some would now take it by violence. It is given to the disciples to know it. It is like a man sowing good seed, not tares. It is like a grain of mustard seed, like leaven, a hidden treasure, a precious pearl, a net. Some will not die until they see the Son coming in it. Those like children are greatest in it, and of such is the Kingdom. The rich cannot enter. It will be taken from the Jews. The scribes shut it up. Its Gospel must be preached. The disciples must drink in it with the Father. The angels will sort out of it those that offend. We should be instructed in it. The parables of the unjust steward, the eleventh hour workman, the king's marriage, the ten virgins, the one, five, and ten talents, are all called parables of the Kingdom, etc.

the subject of Jesus' social teachings, I made a tabular list of all the passages with their contexts in the first three Gospels, where the Kingdom is specifically mentioned, in order to see if any general charterization of them was possible. Assuming these to be the prime data, to them I later added another larger tabular list of passages generally believed to refer to the Kingdom but not mentioning it by name. From a careful scrutiny of these data the most obvious fact about them is their inconsistency and the diametrical contradictions between them which are both many and baffling. Now it is said that few find it; and again it is described as drawing all men and filling the world. It is very hard yet very easy to gain admittance. The perfect scribe or the most exemplary rabbi who would stand up and be slain rather than defend himself on the Sabbath, who has avoided every spot of Levitical uncleanness, and the ingenuous child of fortune, who from his youth has kept all the precepts of the law, both lack the one thing needful, while even the prodigal who has broken every commandment and wasted his substance may find ready access. Sometimes it is described with a wealth of biological analogies, as coming slowly by the method of natural evolution, the blade, then the ear; or it grows like a mustard seed, and while we sleep; and elsewhere it is ushered in with a cataclysm of changes as great as those that mark the advent of one of Plato's new aeons when every process of nature is reversed and the gods turn all things backward. Sometimes it seems very material, and those ambitious for prestige in it are promised thrones and judgeships, or refused them; elsewhere it seems purely spiritual. Now it seems to centre at Jerusalem and to irradiate thence, while John interprets it as eternal life in a transcendental sense, or as truth. Now it seems immediately impending, all the prophecies are to be realized now before the present generation has passed, and we should await daily, if not hourly, some eschatological *dénouement;* while, on the other hand, its coming may be indefinitely postponed for centuries and millennia, and perhaps the counter kingdom of the great adversary will preponderate for a time to test faith. Thus even more than ancient prophecies the utterances concerning the Kingdom are strangely timeless and lack the perspective that distinguishes between things near and far, even in time and space, and it is often impossible to tell whether we are reading of the fall of Jerusalem or the beginning of the Kingdom, or the end of the world.

Before considering Jesus' ideas of the Kingdom in detail, it should be noted again that the more we study the Gospels the clearer does it become that everything in them is in a state of rapid change and development. They are not static, as has commonly been thought, but dynamic. Much that seems discrepant is due to the fact that different stages of development are represented, and all growth is from a severely logical standpoint *per se* inconsistent. If Jesus said all that is ascribed to him about the Kingdom, those who seek to know his mature views concerning it are in the position of one given every saying of a great man on a great theme from childhood on and told that they are all put forth at the same time, stage, or level of his development. On this theme his consciousness was most metamorphic, and we can make no progress till we have some scale on which to measure his development. Probably, too, he was most fluctuating and uncertain, constantly passing from cruder to finer conceptions of it and *vice versa*. How little sense of historic and still less of genetic sequence the Evangelists had is seen in the vast diversity of order of those events and of the sayings about the Kingdom which they all record in common. They were not in a position to realize the development of Jesus' own soul, and the conceptions of his divine nature in the Church since have made this interpretation inapplicable because of Jesus' complete deification. So long as his consciousness was deemed perfect and infallible from the start the problem of apologetics had to be merely to mosaic everything into one picture, whereas the conception of stages of greater or less maturity gives us a vital moving picture, simplifies Christology, puts everything in better perspective, and thus makes the mind and life of Jesus more accessible. To arrange all the data in order along the various lines of development is the problem of genetic psychology. It is neither so very great nor hard, and although it cannot be finished, it can be roughly sketched.

The earlier and lower stages of Jesus' development are of course hopelessly lost, although this loss is perhaps less serious than has been thought because it was largely within the ranges of the normal growth of higher human nature. The Gospels are precious because they are devoted, not to the early stages which are more common to all men, but to the later stages of the rapid evolution of Jesus' higher nature wherein other stories were added that constituted his supremacy. We see him first when he had passed through the steps of unfoldment

common to the best type of men and had entered upon a series of post-adolescent steps of psychic evolution that were peculiar to himself. To this there is only the one great exception of his naïve and almost unconscious attainment of a unique sense of oneness with God before his baptism, to be described below. We can never forget, unfortunately, that these are described by writers who, while they profoundly appreciated all they could in any degree understand, and wrote in a spirit of utter fidelity to what they could not fathom, were quite inadequate to their task in general and lacked all sense of the temporal order of events, believing this of no consequence. For them everything was on one plane. Moreover, time itself was soon to end and hence was a discredited category. Thus sequences are as difficult to make out between the facts contained in the Gospel record as in the order of events Jesus had in mind for the final ushering in of his Kingdom. Thanks to recent criticism we can, however, now discern stages in the development of the record of Jesus' life. Wendt has marked a distinct advance along this line in massing what seems conclusive proof that the Fourth Gospel represents a later redaction of one very early and authentic but independent apostolic tradition, which was wrought into its present form without knowledge of the synoptists although using some of the original sources they knew, and hence in essential accord with them. This view is confirmed by the fact that the subsequent development of Christian doctrine in the early Church was not along the lines of the Fourth Gospel, which looked mainly to the past and was little coloured by the future, nor even by the contemporaneous developments in the larger environment of Christendom. John rather consists largely of the discourses of Jesus, longer and shorter, which according to this view belong to the latter part of his public career, but many of which we regard as referring to conceptions which arose in Jesus' mind before his public career began. These so often only amplify the more concise statements of the other Evangelists that our verdict concerning the chief teachings of Jesus, and even their essential authenticity, need not wait for the further work that critical scholarship has yet to do in detail, large as that work is. If Jesus really taught one coherent doctrine the main perspective of its parts is not likely to change.

Again, it is plain that Jesus did not attain any such definiteness of conviction in his own soul concerning either the detailed constitution

of the Kingdom or the program of its inauguration, as he did concerning his Messianity and sonship. Perhaps he wisely forbore to go into details, either because he felt limitations in himself or believed it better to give general hints, *aperçus*, and suggestions fit to stimulate and capable of diverse types of realization. He must, however, have seen that to interpret the Kingdom in detail when there were no less conflicting conceptions of it than of Messianity itself, would be a matter of great delicacy, and no matter how it was done would increase antagonisms. Perhaps he only dimly felt or intuited certain main features of it which might have grown more coherent and explicit had he lived longer. Indeed, some have thought that he had a program in which sole attention to the Kingdom was placed later. On such assumptions we must regard all his statements and implications concerning the Kingdom as material for such psychoanalysis as we can make, and here more than anywhere else we must seek to get beneath the consciousness of Jesus (which for many recent writers is the cardinal question) to the deeper strata of his unconscious soul. We must indeed boldly attempt nothing less than interpreting to a certain extent what he said into what he meant, and strive to penetrate from the patent to the latent content of his ideas of the Kingdom, a task not only delicate but so difficult that it can be completed only when we know far more than we do at present concerning the nature of the submerged factors of the human soul.

In pursuit of this purpose we must first of all realize the nature of the unique theanthropic self-consciousness of Jesus, which is commonly interpreted as having two sides. (1) On the one hand, so far as he had come to be dominated by the supernormal complex of his Messianity his Kingdom must be of this earth. He would be influenced in forming it by the conception of the type of life represented by the patriarchal sheik, Abraham, with whom the old covenant was made, which was naturally compared with the new covenant which Jesus established. Still more, perhaps, would he be influenced by the ideals of the theocracy, and perhaps more yet by the glory of the Davidic kingdom to which he was the legitimate heir, and most of all doubtless by the Zion of the prophets. How much each of these four determinants or factors entered into his conception of the Kingdom can never be known, but all were present and contributed features. The Messiah must be the great restorer and realizer of ancient purpose

and longings, and it must be in this world, probably centring in Jerusalem.

(2) But Jesus was also dominated by the deep and sublime conviction that he was the Son of God and as such his Kingdom was not of this earth but heavenly. The new Jerusalem was a celestial city of God, established in the empyrean beyond the clouds. It was an apocalyptic vision of the home of the great and good dead, under the immediate rule of God on his throne and the glorified Son sitting at his right hand. In proportion as Jesus saw his work on earth threatened and nearing its end, it was this transcendental Kingdom that became dominant in his mind; thus the sonship constellation or personality impelled to a supernal, just as the Messianic complex did to a terrestrial, realm. Again, the *Jenseits* stood over against and was in some sense antithetical to the *Diesseits*, and as either one grew near or seemed real the other tended to fade. Were either lost the other would be a resource or consolation. There must have been at some stage a schizophrenic tension in Jesus' own soul as he envisaged these two disparate ideals, and some of his utterances concerning the one realm are quite irreconcilable with those concerning the other.

(3) How and how far the immanent and transcendent conceptions of the Kingdom came to be harmonized, is a problem which perhaps we can best approach by collecting and grouping all the characterizations of the Kingdom, without reference to where they stand in the Gospels, into an intelligible genetic order. From such a table we may opine that the oldest and the germ of all was the conception that the Kingdom was entirely within the individual. The regenerate soul found itself in a new realm. The passion to love and serve God made all else seem unattractive and uninteresting, and the world underwent a radical transvaluation. There was a new joy, peace, health, vigour, love in the soul, that nothing could surpass. Nothing could express the inner sense of beatitude and the invincible certitude of having found the chief end of life. The first promise of the Kingdom in the Gospels is to the poor in spirit, or to those who make the least demands upon life for themselves, and also to those persecuted for righteousness' sake, that is, to those who have abandoned the ambitions of this world or been unjustly outlawed by it. The Kingdom at first consisted of Jesus and his disciples, and they had followed the Baptist's proclama-

tion, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." To repent indeed was to be born into it. To confess and forsake, that is, to evict evil, is self-initiation into it. It does not come by outer observation but is within each. This is the Kingdom we must first seek, and to it all else will be added. To those who do this it is given to know its mysteries. Thus it is a hidden treasure, a pearl of great price. In fine, it is found in Christian experience.

(4) But man is gregarious, a *socius*, and no man lives to himself. The new life is not only intensely inward and solitary, but must have vent and companionship, and the outer Kingdom begins in collectivity, sharing all things. Each must confess and exhort the others. The newborn must assemble and pray with and for and impart all to all in a new community. The lofty classic traditions of *amicitia*, or friendship as represented by Aristotle and Cicero, must be developed into the yet higher brotherly love and mutual service, which must be with abandon. Not only must the Golden Rule be followed, but each must prefer the other to himself. Thus a new and higher solidarity, typified by the sacred symposium of the Lord's Supper and by the *agapæ* or love-feasts, with their perilous embrace and kiss, is symbolic of the very closest of all ties of affection, above those even of husband and wife, parent and child. Perhaps never was mutual service such a passion. In such union there is strength indeed, and wherever so few gathered in the spirit the Lord was present with them. No such communion of soul was ever possible before. Men never got so near together as did these early Christians, heartening one another to endure hardship and even the most cruel martyrdom. "How the Christians love one another!" was the comment. In all the hundreds of types of organization, secret and open, before and since, for cultural, convivial, reformatory, reciprocal, health, business and financial enterprises, and all the rest, there was never such merging of individual ends in the common weal, such a degree of utter loyalty to a common cause, or such unreserved sinking of personal into group consciousness. This little Kingdom (big with promise and potency of a vaster one) was founded with a sense that it and its members were the light, the salt, leaven, seed, of a new world-order. Other Eldorados have been largely external, and consisted chiefly in ideal environments, working inward. This was a new inward life with a special organ of its own working outward. Others have been political or aimed at civic or industrial

ends, but this was primarily and purely ethical, based solely upon the ideals of virtue, morality, justice, and mercy.

Myth at its best is larger than philosophy or literature, for no individual can compass all the dimensions of a great mythopœic theme. It underlies rites, beliefs, customs, and cults, and is almost as comprehensive as the psychology of races. Even religions may be almost said to live, move, and have their being in it. The greatest of these ethnic themes is that of an ideal social state or a realm where all that is coincides with all that ought to be. Sometimes this ideal is very crass and sensuous. It is often described with great poetic license and abandon; e. g., the north pole blossoms, dolphins carry men, the seas are lemonade or wine, the earth yields exuberant fruits without toil, the land flows with milk and honey. It is a realm of the magic *Tarnkappe*, wand, bowl, sword, ring, boat. Perhaps there are fairies, diamond pavements, no deserts, disease, or pain. The gods are friendly and familiar. Old age is curable in a Fountain of Youth. The world is young, man pure and unfallen. The earth is full of beauty; and war, fear, anger, and hate are unknown. These paradises of old are often placed in the past, and the idylls or sagas about them are cradle-songs of primitive and perhaps autochthonic men.[1] Perhaps Warren[2] is right that this *cunabulum gentium* was near the north pole, while for very different reasons Wallace thinks it may have been Siberian. Haeckel identifies it with his sunken Lemuria, in the Indian Ocean. Others suggest a sunken Atlantis between Africa and South America, of which modern theosophists have given us such a detailed story. Columbus thought it up the Orinoco, which he deemed one of the four streams flowing down from paradise where heaven and earth joined and where he would perhaps find a sacred *omphalos* where earth's navel string with heaven had been cut. For Dante it was on the summit of the purgatorial mountain. Philology has suggested the Northern Himalayas or Eastern Persia. One anthropologist puts it in Scandinavia, and thinks Adam spoke Swedish. Perhaps the Flood wiped out traces of it. Nor was it all a *fata morgana* or real Eldorado, but it made a convenient point of departure for the history of many people for which it furnished so pregnant a prologue. In classic days its outlines were fancied as the age of Saturn, or when Kronos ruled before

[1] Edmund Pfleiderer: "Die Idee eines goldenen Zeitalters." Berlin, Reimer, 1877, 172 p.
[2] Wm. Fairfield Warren: "Paradise Found." Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1886, 505 p.

the Olympian dynasty. The Roman saturnalia were kept as a memorial of it, and there were presents and games. Slaves were served by their masters until it degenerated to Bacchanalian license. For the Jews one day in seven was kept in memory of it as sacred to paradise, and the year of jubilee to prevent gravitation of capital into a few hands was commemorative of it. It was the point where eternity touched time. Indeed it is so purely mythic that the very conditions of its existence have never been realized, but probably as Pfleiderer says it is true to the law, "*Das Schöne blüht nur im Gesang*" and these writers postulate everywhere what exists nowhere.

Great things have been done in the past. Not only has language evolved but along with it, in even its primitive forms, the most marvellous grammatical construction. Instinct has developed perhaps as lapsed intelligence. Early social institutions often seem to be the work of unfathomable intelligence. Utopia may be located in the country for the city child, and indeed it was for Rousseau. Vergil's "Bucolics" were written and had great charm because Greek and Roman civilization were decaying, and often Hyperboreans, Getæ, Thracians, were used as symbols of regenerative energies as were the ancient Germans by Tacitus. So in the French Revolution the cry was "Back to nature," and there were abundant dreams and romances of a new dispensation when man rollicked and frolicked in Arcadia and realized the importance at least of not losing barbaric virtues in developing those of culture. But the wisest men long ago began to see that if any such apotheosis of social man really occurred it would be in the future, was not in the past; for man has evolved from an animal state and the twilight of the gods is the dusk not of evening but of dawn. Hence the passion for progress, and hence so many men and races, like the ancient alchemists, have died from drinking their own elixir of cultural, social, political reform. All the scores of early constitutions that Aristotle collected had fatal flaws, and our star of paradise is a morning and not an evening star.

The working power of these popular ideals has been incomparable. In contrast with them those of Saint-Simon, Fourier, Prudhomme, Rodbertus, La Salle, Comte, and all modern social reformers since Bellamy and George and professional sociologists, are partial, fragmentary, and superficial. Indeed, not only society but even business is far too complex to be grasped by any individual mind. And yet true

statesmanship requires mastery in just this field; and many a writer, from Aristotle down to the anonymous author of "Rembrandt als Erzieher" have agreed that the supreme artist is he who deals with the material of human nature. He will be a doer, and so far beyond the professor who merely knows. But society is a monster obeying its own laws, which we are just beginning to understand and may construe mathematically according to Jevons or Walras, or biologically like Lilienfeld, Schaeffle, or Worms, with its own anatomy, physiology, pathology. But we had better more modestly begin with Tarde, who studied single laws, or with Letourneau, and start with beginnings of single institutions if not with animal societies like Espinas and Perrier, or with small country communities like the school of Du Prey.

Much as the cult of Jesus owed to the cults of dying and rising gods all about it, his conceptions of the Kingdom owed nothing to these pagan ideals of a golden age, but from first to last stood in sharpest contrast to them in two fundamental points. It began within, and it was purely ethical. If we put the burden of Jesus' teaching into modern psychological terms, it is that if the individual utterly subordinates himself to love and serve his fellow-man, which is the quintessence of morality, and to love and serve God, who represents the all-embracing universe, which is the quintessence of religion, he comes into a new and hitherto undiscovered or at least unexplored continent of human experience. It is of a higher order, and brings new insights into the world, which takes on a unitary, ethical, spiritual character, and brings a new reinforcement of the will and a new depth and range of emotion not only humanistic but cosmic. This experience is so *sui generis* that it seems to come *ab extra* like a revelation or a gift. It not only subordinates volition to its purpose but impels it with the momentum of the main current of history and evolution. So new is it that it must have miracles as tropes of this humanization of the world's dynamism. It also suffuses the soul with a love not only of man but of all being which far transcends the best that sex love has to offer. Just because such experience is unique and exalted and becomes possible only long after the means of expression had been developed, it cannot be adequately described but always seems a mystery, a state superinduced as from on high. Individuation develops to its uttermost, and having attained its goal it becomes completely subordinated to the race. It is so blessed that if the best and richest of men, most widely known

and praised, were to make himself an obscure pauper, deliberately destroy his good name and become an object of hate and contempt, suffer all pain, and leave his family, like Buddha, all these would seem as dross if he thereby gained this peculiar experience, which is related to ordinary life somewhat as the deathless germ plasm is to the moribund soma. This can never be fully believed on testimony. It must be tried and experimentally proven. It is not meant, perhaps, that all should go so far, but only a few; but all must go far enough to have faith in the fact of this higher potentialization of life by realizing that much of it can be attained with less than supreme renunciation. This subjection to the species is only the law of life in the plant- and animal-world, where every detail of form and function is never for the individual but always in the interests of the species. To break away from this law and to set up for self violates nature and constitutes the bottom sin or disease in the world.

Although gradually attained by him, this experience was the heart of the heart of Jesus' life. It gave it a unique organic unity that doctrinal systems can only faintly mirror or typify. This experience was the apperception organ by which he knew and interpreted everything in his ken. It gave harmony and consistency to the most contradictory things that he said concerning the Kingdom, such as whether it was inner or outer, of this world or another. He knew that this conception would grow and transform the world, and that it represented a higher plane of life which would never be entirely lost. This was the first theme of his teaching before he had developed a sense of his own relation to it as Messiah or Son of God, which so transformed it, and he began by describing its inner charm to those who could enter it. As opposition grew and the available time seemed short, he developed a steadily increasing sense of the calamity of missing it and of the doom of those who did so. In doing this he borrowed his imagery from the great prophets of the captivity, especially Daniel, with whom there began a unique apocalyptic style which affected not only canonical but apocryphal writings.[1] This had its own vocabulary of characteristic Hebrew words which Harper has compiled, and which is so marked in Enoch. It is a unique literary phenomenon, and requires some special interpretation. It is more commonly used in treating

[1] H. P. Nichols: "The Temporary and Permanent in the New Testament Revelation." New York, 1905. Lecture 6. See, too, Harper: "The Prophetic Element in the Old Testament." Chicago, 1905, p. 128 *et seq.*

such topics as death, resurrection, judgment, millennium, heaven and hell, and is most marked in Jesus' eschatological utterances. Its figures are intense, sometimes gross, a trifle fantastic, artificial, enigmatic, and even contradictory. It is commonly applied to mysteries that were challenging, and it makes Daniel seem arrogant and better informed concerning the next world than this. Its conjuring phrases are often repeated. Its religion is catastrophic, so that it has always been a favourite of Montanists, chiliasts, and Adventists. It is not the style of history, fact, or prose, but of poetry and vision, and its theology might be described as sung. Weiss thinks that Jesus' use of this resource, especially after the shadow of the cross fell upon his life, was often exaggerated, but these phrases gave him courage and strength in desperate state. The synoptists remembered, loved, and best recorded these utterances which are often devotional and have ever since frequently recurred in liturgies and lectionaries. It was the style of the Sabbath rather than the week-day. We cannot entirely agree with Muirhead[1] that their key has been found; for they have always given rise to the greatest diversity of interpretation, so that just what they mean is the most challenging of all the problems in the New Testament. What ought to be is, shall be, and always was, everywhere. The coming of the Kingdom is entirely conditioned by man's responses to it. It gave elasticity to apostolic institutions and ordinances, and is well fitted to the use of those who wish to apply all the resources at their command to the need of the present moment, so that despite its hazy mysticism it is intensely practical.

Unlike all pagan conceptions of the last things or the social *summum bonum*, the moral dualism of the Kingdom is intense. All benefited in the gentile conceptions of an ideal state; but in Jesus' conception there was to be a great sifting, and all the bad were to be swept away. As his obsession of impending judgment grew, he believed and used to the uttermost the tremendous stimulus of his conviction that it was not only certain but very near. He had no presentiment of the millennia that were to intervene. The barren fig-tree was given only the briefest respite. His followers were to pray for it, and watch every sign of its approach. When it came it would be a catastrophe of inconceivable magnitude. Nature would be convulsed, transformed, the powers of evil let loose. All the vengeance since Abel

[1] "Eschatology of Jesus." New York, 1904.

would be poured out. The doom of the world would be like that of Sodom and Gomorrah, and Wendt thinks that some of the phrases descriptive of it were interpolated, being reflected back from the fall of Jerusalem. Hence his followers must be ever ready, for the end might come at any moment. It was not necessary to organize even the apostolate, or weed tares from the wheat. Although the disciples were sent like sheep among wolves, they must do their work with all dispatch like those who warn sleeping villages of a breaking dam and a great inundation. They must shout their message from the housetop, and take all risks and dangers.

Besides the scores of specific mentions in the synoptists of the Kingdom it was the chief theme of Jesus' teachings and it was to preserve his sayings about it that the logia were gathered. Not only are his utterances as they stand, however, hopelessly discordant and contradictory, but, from Holtzmann's collection of definitions of it as interpreted by scholars, their ideas of what Jesus meant by it are no less irreconcilable. From this the only sane inference is that if the sayings represent one fixed or final stage, then his mind was in utter confusion about it, if, indeed, he did not have delusions respecting it that were not even systematized. In the social Christian movement of the last two decades, which has made the Kingdom the theme of most active and voluminous discussion, almost every phrase of Jesus touching it has been made central for the interpretation of the rest, and about every reform—personal, social, business, political, religious, moral, wise, or otherwise—has been given his sanction, although there is generally a transcendental residuum of utterances which has been treated with a very different theological and mystic *Einstellung*.

The chief directive lines (*Richtlinien*) along which all his sayings can be arranged are the following: (a) the Kingdom is inner or outer. (b) It is on earth or in heaven, that is, in this life or the next. (c) It is present or future. (d) It is of slow growth or comes with catastrophic suddenness. (e) It is attained by struggle, or is a free gift to be received passively. (f) It has a benign aspect for the good and a malign one for the bad; i. e., it comes as a boon to the former and a doom to the latter. (g) It comes more or less independently of Jesus, or he is the central agent in bringing it in, and its head. Everything said of it has its place on one or all of these seven lines of antithesis. Arranging them on such a scale, the only possible conclusion is that each group of

them thus deployed represents a genetic stage in the development of Our Lord's views about it or that these lines are developmental. Thus from first to last his conceptions of it were in a state of rapid evolutionary flux and transformation, and the inconsistencies and contradictions are those that are always involved in growth. Can any reordering of these give us a clue to thrid the maze and escape the chaos of present interpretations? As a perhaps overbold and professedly tentative psychoanalytic first step the following is suggested:

1. Jesus' first teaching of the Kingdom was that it was all inward and personal rather than social. It was righteousness, joy, peace, purity, first sanctifying self. It was in the invisible realm of the individual heart. It was the goal of all the good tendencies of history, and more specifically of prophecy. It meant enthusiastic moral reform, a new zest toward or aspiration for perfection. There was little or nothing of the Baptist's awful imprecations or threats, no new dispensation coming to sweep away the old order of things and bring in a new one. Jesus had profited by the fate of John and kept aloof from him, and his doctrine of repentance was far less drastic. He had himself grown into the new higher life naïvely and naturally without convulsive reconstruction, and assumed in others the possibility of doing as he had done. He did not even baptize, but regarded this rite as simply washing away uncleanness and not as a baptism of fire. His relation to those he taught was simply that of one who had found the way of truth, rest, peace, and the higher life, and who wished others to follow in the steps he had taken before his baptism. He was full of a great new joy as well as of the all-transforming insights which followed his own baptism, and sought companions and disciples in this fresh and glowing experience. His beatitudes were upon a simple, single, humble, clean life of service and self-abnegation, harmlessness, nonresistance, childlikeness. Neither Herod nor the rabbis could fear or object to this. The supreme realm of what ought to be was in the heart. To discover and make landfall on this new world within was his great achievement and should be the supreme quest of life, compared to which the loss of eye or hand, or the sacredest of family ties, was of minor account. To acquire such a treasure all else might be sacrificed. It was meat and drink for the very soul that others knew not of. Thus, having lately come to the full realization of his own Messianity, his first chief task was to interpret the Messianic Kingdom,

and thus his first conception of it was sweet, mild, subjective, as the one thing of supreme worth. It was so hidden and inoffensive that no member of the hierarchy or representative of the state could object or suspect, for he seemed only a preacher of a more perfect individual holiness. Thus there was no danger of any such calamity to him or his cause as had befallen the Baptist. At this stage Jesus made no enemies. To it would probably belong the parables of the prodigal son, the lost sheep and penny, perhaps the sower, forgiveness seventy times seven, no fasting when the bridegroom is present, the eleventh-hour labourer, the budding fig-tree as a herald of spring, the city on a hill, the scribe instructed in the Kingdom, etc. This stage of Jesus' teaching was illustrated by the first invitation of the guests to a feast. In this initial stage Jesus' tone was most exuberant. Hope was at its highest, and there were almost no antagonisms or oppositions. All was positive, optimistic. The people listened gladly. The disciples whom he chose, perhaps with less critical scrutiny because of the general spirit of buoyancy, left all and followed on the instant, and this presaged an easy, triumphant, and unresisted progress. Thus Jesus began at the positive end of each of the above lines from (a) to (f) inclusive, although the chief progress was along (g), for his sense of his own leadership was greatly augmented.

2. But his fame and the charm and magnetism of his personality proved very effective therapeutically in Galilee, which abounded with neurotics, and in an age when cure was exorcism. Thus, besides being a physician of the soul, Jesus found himself more and more revered as a physician of the body. This was not within the scope of his first purpose, and gave him pause, as well it might. His human sympathies made it hard to refuse the importunity of the sick and their friends, but there was an ominous danger of diversion from his prime intention and of distracting the attention of his hearers from his doctrine. Now came the first clear note of conflict which was with the demons whom he expelled, who represented the hostile kingdom of Satan. It was they who first recognized his Messianity and his lordship over them, if somewhat to his dismay. Healing was a victorious sally into the territory of the Great Enemy whom after his death he was to despoil in his stronghold. This therapeutic work brought new acclaim and gave his mission its first clear note of militancy. He must oppose the counter-kingdom of the great adversary at every step. The world is

dual, and good and evil are so opposed that every gain of either means loss to the other. The realization that he had power over Satan's realm greatly augmented his own secret sense of his dignity, for it showed that his work had a supernatural significance. He and his Kingdom stood over against Satan and his hosts. It was from his minions, too, that he heard the first and ardently longed for recognition of the office he had assumed when as yet no one else knew him for what he was, and hence there was a great advance along the line (g), for his person and work now had a supernal sanction. Along (f) there were now objects of abhorrence and imprecation while along (e) the element of struggle was emphasized, and on line (f) this earth was more or less transcended. If he could withstand the devil he must be sent by God. Cosmic powers were involved in the battle now on, and he was heaven's chosen champion. The realization of all this was an epoch indeed. Now he first began to draw upon the imagery of Daniel. Moreover, as the enemy was transcendent, so must the Kingdom be not merely of earth but of heaven. It could no longer remain immanent only. Henceforth what he said of it might always have a double meaning. Still, the individual soul was the theatre of all the warfare, while the conception of attaining the Kingdom now underwent much modification. It was not easy, but hard, to win; for there was resistance by the powers of evil at every step. It was no longer conceived as a state to be born in or grow into, but to be won by conflict. Sin, too, now was devils' sickness and needed more drastic treatment. The new life was less spontaneous, for there was always a root of evil to be plucked out. Fornication, hypocrisy, lies, greed, sensuousness, must be extirpated and not charmed away by the lure of beatitudes.

3. The hierarchy took note of his cures as it had not of his doctrine, and accused him of evicting devils as Beelzebub their prince, the most truculent and blasphemous of charges. Not only this, but he had dared to take the rash and perhaps ill-considered step of pardoning the sins of some he healed. This seemed a most flagrant usurpation of divine power. Thus, to his surprise and grief, Jesus found not only that the Kingdom did not draw all, but that those in the highest places of authority, whom he had been taught to revere, were arrayed against both it and him. We can understand what he meant when in removing the physical consequences of sin he pronounced the sins of his patients

forgiven, fatal as was the strategic mistake he made in doing so, if he wished to avoid or delay the rupture with Jewish orthodoxy, for now it was at as implacable enmity with his cause as were the leagued demons. The prophets of old had defied and rebuked not only kings but priests; but there had never been so open and bitter a warfare, and now the gentle Jesus was roused to the utmost rage and fury against the conservatives in the very faith in which he had been reared, and had to fight them with no less abandon, if by different methods, than he had assailed Satan's agents. His Kingdom could not be set up in the temple or even at Jerusalem so long as it was unoverturned. If it came there not one stone would remain upon another, but all must be rebuilt from the foundation. Its rulers were blind leaders of the blind, unfaithful tenants, vipers, whited sepulchres, and their cult is a barren fig-tree to be cut down and burned. Thus now the catastrophic conception of the advent of the Kingdom, if it did not begin, had here its chief augmentation, for it could not come among the gentiles, but must be a new Jerusalem, and hence the new ictus of the apocalyptic motif. It might come down from heaven, but at the very least it implied a radical transformation. Jesus could compel demons but not the souls of the Pharisees, and so God as the only recourse must intervene. Thus, in the face of rabbinical opposition Jesus' unconquerable soul appealed to transcendental divine powers to effect the great metamorphosis necessary to inaugurate the new Kingdom. What he could not do himself God would accomplish, and would perfect outwardly what he had begun inwardly. The goal of life which he had attained was so blessed, so certainly God's final purpose in creating man, that he would and must give it a worthy outer installation, and that, too, among his own chosen people in the land of the promises, very soon, very gloriously. He would just as surely do so as Jesus was the Messiah. The disciples did not yet know whom he claimed to be, for he had not proclaimed it; but the more perspicacious priesthood had clearly divined it, for indeed he had himself betrayed it in forgiving sins if only incidentally to healing. At this stage it was, therefore, that the great appeal was taken to Yahveh. He would overturn in the Holy Land until all was fit, and then usher in the Kingdom, subduing Satan, binding the beast of political domination, destroying the wicked, and creating a new earth worthy of the new installation of man into his true Kingdom.

4. Finally, as Jesus realized that he must die, and that soon, his conceptions of the Kingdom became more celestial and post-mortem. Admission to it would depend upon a verdict at a great judgment day for which the dead would be resurrected. Earth faded somewhat in his thought and would be destroyed by fire; and the good go to dwell with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and the wicked be consigned to hell-fire forever. The Son would come in glory; the elect would be gathered and transported to heaven. The Kingdom was spiritual in the skies. The day of probation, grace, and mercy would have ceased, and no importunity would avail in the great day of fate and finality, for the last hour of history would have struck. A gulf which none could cross would yawn between even members of families. Danielitic imagery was more often resorted to, and there was more abandon on the part of Jesus to a state of ideality. There was a note of ecstasy about the future state as death became his muse and his mind became increasingly thanatotropic, while the Kingdom grew transcendental and more detached from this world.

Although he had fully accepted death as his fate, and perhaps as willed by the Father, he would not have been human had he not felt toward the wickedness that had brought it about the same wrath that in the Old Testament so often flamed up in Yahveh against sin and iniquity. He would have been a Docetic phantom or dummy of heaven not to have felt his death an outrage upon justice. Indignation was the natural and inevitable reaction of a just and innocent soul against those who had made the best in him the worst. His very consciousness of innocence would give him no less unique realization of the evil which was arrayed against him, and which filled him with increasing surprise and dismay as he came to know it. The ban of excommunication of the Church later pronounced against Spinoza was no more scathing and sublime and almost blood-curdling than his imprecation and invectives against the scribes and Pharisees in the third stage. But here in the fourth he no longer spoke *in propria persona*, but hurled the awful curse of God upon the wicked, chanting the old prophetic litany against them. In three of the five judgment-day scenes the Son reigns in heaven, and in those in which he returns he does so for judgment. There are signs and wonders in heaven, and on earth pestilences, wars, false Christs. The sun and moon darken; the stars fall; heaven and earth quake. All nations are to be gathered and parted as sheep and

goats, and the sentence upon both (Matt. xxiv: 41-46) is based upon their treatment of Jesus. But his greatness of soul is seen here in the fact that even the whirlwind of his indignation is directed not against the immediate agents of his suffering and death but against the general depravity that was the ultimate cause of all, and it is made yet more sublime in that the items of the condemnation are so systematically balanced by the benedictions and rewards upon the faithful.

Thus the conception of genetic stages alone can bring order out of the otherwise unharmonizable utterances relating to the Kingdom. Without this temporal perspective they must remain as they have always been, sibylline leaves arrangeable in any order or blown about by the winds of doctrine. On this view everything has its place and also its perfect natural explanation. Jesus began to teach it as a blessed mystic inner state easily accessible to all, just as he himself had attained it, by intuitive insight and self-consecration by counsels of perfection. This state was the supreme end of life, the highest of all worths and values. He proclaimed it with great and deliberate sagacity, amply safeguarded against all political opposition. There was no antagonism such as John's announcement of it had aroused. Thus the first interpretation of the Kingdom was the loftiest, purest, best, and sanest. When he came to conceive it later as a campaign against Satan's kingdom, as he did when he yielded to the demand to become a healer and caster-out of devils who acclaimed him as Messiah, his theanthropic consciousness underwent a great and sudden augmentation and a new note of conflict was struck; but it was with supernal powers and the issues suddenly assumed superterrestrial dimensions. He became a champion and leader of supermundane spiritual energies against other opposing but also invisible forces, and this evoked in Jesus' soul new subconscious energies from their latent depths and gave him a new sense of solitariness, and also a no less unique one of greatness. He became yet more an agent of destiny and of God. An unforeseen war was precipitated which could be crowned with victory only when Satan and his crew had been driven out, his innocent victims set free, and he bound and sealed up in a pit. Thus Jesus assumed in some sense a Michael-like function as a leader of the hosts of God against those of the great enemy. Had he not healed or thought himself recognized as heaven's vicegerent by the demons he evicted, these first motives of transcendentalizing the King-

dom would have been lacking and its enemies would have been for the time all of this world. But the drama would have been incomplete and less thrilling, and deep unconscious motivations less involved. If this would have given the Kingdom a fuller and richer ethical development, it would also have had less power to enlist the deeper energies of the soul which are always objectified as supernatural powers.

But when the opposition of the Jews developed its strength in the third stage, Jesus was brought face to face with one of the most significant alternatives in all his career. When it became plain that the Kingdom could not be established at Jerusalem, he might have taken the great appeal to the gentile world, as Paul did later. This, however, his intense Judaism made him unable to do, and so his invincible pertinacity took refuge in the future and in a superior world-order. The conviction attained in the second stage, that supernal powers were enlisted and embattled, also predisposed him to develop the old prophetic idea of a new dispensation sweeping away the present Hebrew cult, as construed by the scribes and Pharisees, and establishing a new heavenly Jerusalem and temple, and all this miraculously and convulsively. His very diathesis was perfervid and even fulminating. For him all that ought to be was certain, and what was certain must be soon.

In fact, it was the Church of the gentiles, and not a divine visitation, that was destined to leave the Jewish dispensation desolate. Sublunary and slow developments were to work all the destruction his perspectiveless mind saw as immediate. Paul in a sense only translated the changes which Jesus expected from divine intervention into their earthly vicariates and surrogates. The Jews were rejected, and not swept away. The *diaspora* is not yet ended, and in his day was only begun. Not a spectacular assize but the verdict of the Church composed of then heathen races sat in judgment upon them, and the verdict was the long-delayed one of history. The drama was to be played to the end of the fifth act here, and not transferred at the end of the fourth to a transcendent realm at the death of Jesus, which was only the beginning and did not mark or prelude the end of the earthly kingdom. Paul interpreted much of Jesus' incoherent and troubled nightmare dreams into a practical program, set it in scene on earth, and not in cloudland, although he did not reduce it all to immanence.

The later forms of Jesus' eschatology were, in psychoanalytic terms, the products of a protective mechanism enshrining his great hope when it had become desperate and seemed to him incapable of realization by even the best normal human endeavours, so that he had committed its accomplishment back into God's hands. Paul's appeal was to God, too, but also to the gentile world. He would bring in the Kingdom through its means and not by the destruction of Judaism, a remnant of which at least would also be brought into it. His goal and method were a psychodynamic equivalent of Jesus' vision, although human was to do more and divine agency less. Or, rather, God would make more use of man's efforts in bringing it about, and work was a larger supplement of prayer.

The Kingdom is so many-sided that we must go deep to explain or understand it, and also we must go back of the baptism and of the beginning of the public ministry to do so. The psychogenetic root of it all was that, unknown to others and with no realization of what was involved in it, Jesus had naïvely and more or less unconsciously (as great genius works), already found through a pure, simple, guileless life, and by self-communion and meditation, an inner way to the highest or the divine. In the language of the piety of his day rather than in that of psychology, he had found God. He had yearned to attain the maximum of perfection, or, in Scripture language, he had hungered for righteousness with all his heart. As other ingenuous youth seek for love, fame, greatness, wealth, or power, so all the energies of his soul were directed to holiness. In this quest he had put all other things aside. It seemed to him the *summum bonum*, the supreme goal of life and of all endeavour, something so precious that it must be sought even though all ties of blood and family affection had to be sundered in the quest. Not only had he striven, but he had made the great Eureka discovery and attained the goal he sought. He had realized that life is service. His own individuality had been caught up, inundated, merged in the vaster life of the race of which he became a biophore. This experience had unlocked new energies within; had brought great inner exaltation and a new access of vitality so great that even death could not be conceived as able to daunt or quell it, and if it came resurrection was inevitable. This put him in the centre of the current of creative evolutionary processes. Instinct, reason, conscience, will, could no longer collide, but must reinforce and summate each other. So

positive was this experience that before it all negations and limitations fell away, and in place of repressions there was a great expansion of the soul which was now fed by the inner mystic bread of life that others knew not of. It brought a sense of ecstasy and raised life above the ordinary familiar ranges of humanity. Of this experience all miracles are symbols, and become true in a higher than literal sense if they remain symbols. It brought a new Sabbath of rest in the brooding peace of God, made pure oughtness no longer merely an imperative but a passion, and removed every trace of heteronomy. One had only to awake, arise, hear, see, do. It may be described as dying to sin or passing from death to life, or as becoming true sons of God with his will as the only law. It is also to be free.

It was with some such inner personal experience as this glowing in his heart but not yet explicit or realized that Jesus, doubtless with hesitation, came to John, although he felt his standpoint so much beyond that of the Baptist that he declared that the least in the Kingdom was greater than he. He had even then little sympathy with John's denunciatory methods. He had made as yet no resolution to proclaim his experiences or to seek, save in a private personal way, to guide others along the way he had found, nor had he planned to organize any movement or to abandon his occupation. He did not yet dream that he was the Messiah, or that the sonship he had achieved was more than other zealous seekers might attain of themselves. But the new Kingdom was already founded in his own soul, although in an embryonic stage, with parturition just impending, while John was destined, although unwittingly to both, to be its midwife. Thus this interior way to God opened in the quest for perfection was the deepest and most central thing in Jesus' experience and in his teaching. This is the key to unlock all; to understand it is at once the hardest, most challenging, and yet the most imperative problem of Christianity, and to realize it is salvation. Although for Jesus it was virtually a *fait complet* at the baptism, its progressive realization in the world was a futuristic problem, and hence what followed gave the Kingdom a predominantly eschatological character.

Now, since the way to the goal of life opens from within the soul, its attainment would seem naturally to be sought by solitude and meditation. Jesus himself often retired to be alone and pray, and anchoritic cults arose in which by introversion, visions, vigils, fasting,

and self-castigation of soul and even body, man sought his God. Hence we now face the great but never yet adequately explained problem why Christianity became a social religion instead of sending its devotees in isolation into cells or the wilderness to save each his own soul. This would have been the result had Jesus' development of the Kingdom been completed or arrested at the first stage, as in fact Buddha's cult was. Jesus had found his way out to the open sea of eternal peace and joy more inwardly and with less dramatic incidents of renunciation, so that from the Baptism on he transcended Buddha. How, then, was the Kingdom given its so pronounced social character, especially as organization was not imperative in view of the nearness of the end? It was not enough to define it successively over against Satan's kingdom, the Jewish hierarchy and a world of sin. Why must and did those who entered Jesus' Kingdom get and keep so close together? Why should those divinely ruled be a company or brotherhood? How came it that the charm of *amicitia* or classic friendship so praised by ancient moralists before the development of romantic love, who taught that the good and only they could and should become true friends, was not only realized but so far transcended in the early Christian community? Whence came the brotherly love that made each prefer the other, the community of goods, the symbiosis in which the rules of the higher life became the canticles of love? The answer to this problem can only be found in the psychological realm of inward intimate experience genetically evolved. As Jesus advanced in his conceptions and convictions of his own Messianity and sonship, he came to realize that his own seeking and finding had been unique and above and beyond what was attainable by others, for he had at first naïvely assumed that all could reach it as naturally as he had done. Then he tried to teach that it was achieved, to develop the *word* that should guide to and in the *way*. But it could not all be set forth in precept, for there were deep subjective factors in it that could not be adequately objectified. He called disciples whom he thought apt, instructed them, and sent them forth on the first mission to teach others, and thus to know and establish themselves the more firmly. But the parables and miracles symbolizing it, effective as they were, did not convey it all. Having appealed to the intellect, the intuitions, and then to the will of his adherents, he realized that he must now go deeper and reach the lower stratum of sentiment and feeling by an

appeal such as had never before been made to the instincts of personal loyalty, love, and intuitive identification with his own person. His followers must feel the very breathings and pulsations of his own soul, and be made one with him in the subconscious depths of life by a subtle induction of personality. Thus he strove to develop every trope and symbol of consubstantiality between him and them. In this endeavour he naturally had recourse to the rich but very portative thought-forms of the totemistic cycle of the ancient folk-soul[1] which even to-day and in that age still more pervaded life, although the origin of these antique moduli of the psyche was unrecognized. He also availed himself of the yet more faded but effective and recognizable traces of the primitive concepts of blood covenant[2] of which there were abundant remnants. His disciples were to eat his flesh and drink his blood; they were members of his body; he was the vine and they the branches; and as he was one with God, they were one with him. He was the way through whom they could reach God. He was in them and they in him. He was the middleman or mediator through whom God reached man and was reached by him. All his relations to God they must establish to him. No other religious founder had ever sought to thus bind his disciples to his own person. Ritschl has called the Kingdom not only bibliopaidic and pistobasic but essentially Christocentric. Thus Jesus became a more tangible proxy and surrogate of God. It was thus easier for his followers to find God than it had been for him, and this was as he wished.

From this it followed that the relations of the disciples to one another became unprecedentedly close. They were members one of another because members of him. When he was gone he survived as the tie that bound them together, and the degree of this love of each for the others was also the degree of his persistence as a living reality. To love and serve a brother was to love and serve him; and this they must do to each other, even as to him. He lived in, and indeed was, their mutual devotion. A union thus cemented had a unique strength, and he was this strength. Jesus never dreamed that the first fellowship meal would become a permanent sacrament or stereotyped institution, or that his prayer, which was intended only as an illustration of the spirit of prayer, would become a standard, to be repeated through

[1] S. Freud: "Totem und Tabu." Leipzig, 1913, 149 p.
[2] Henry Clay Trumbull: "Blood Covenant." New York, Scribner's.

ages *ipsissimis verbis* as the one best and official model of appeal to the Divine, any more than he thought that Peter would become primate of the Church. As Bousset[1] well says, he drew very few of the logical consequences of his teaching, for his perspective of the future was very short. He did not realize the implications of his doctrine, which Sabatier[2] is so fond of insisting are even yet, in large part, unrealized practically or even theoretically by his followers. He never dreamed of what F. G. Peabody calls the "calisthenics of religious rites," or the "cold storage of orthodox opinion," or a collection of specifics or panaceas for reform, or the mechanisms of legislation that would follow. He was simply full of the great and undefined hope of the world which, as Pott[3] has shown, later grew into the Pauline doctrine of faith. The forces he knew and dealt with were those that worked from within outward and not those which began externally and worked inward. It can thus be only obtuseness to this potent inner psychic factor that has sought to explain the fraternal bond that bound the primitive Christians by the common dangers involved in the nine persecutions, or as the cadenced step of common zeal for missionary propaganda, nor can it be explained as social coöperation in quest of the great treasure, for all of these influences had dispersive as well as fraternizing tendencies. The root of the solidarity was the magnetism and charm of Jesus' own personality, the magic of his words, the purity and ingenuousness of his character, and especially the naturally thrilling, melting effect of the unutterable pathos of his death and the transcendent glory of the Resurrection. These together made him the focus and cynosure of all who believed on him. The Pauline conception of a sacrificial ransom or a hero invoking God's wrath upon his own head to divert it from others was only a half figurative objectivization, effective as it was through its long day, of the instinctive *Einfühlung* into the sublimity of Jesus' virtue which overtopped that of all others and that fused hearts, minds, and wills into a common devotion. Thus he reached the acme of leadership, as those in his train did of hero-worship. Death usually dampens the authority of leaders, but it immeasurably exalted his. There had never been such a soul-compeller, such an authority, such a master of those who strive to know, do, and feel the best life has to offer. No life had been so

[1] Bousset: "Teachings of Jesus." London, 1906. Chapter 6, "The Kingdom."
[2] Louis Auguste Sabatier: "Doctrine of the Atonement and Its Historical Evolution." London, 1904, 228 p.
[3] A. Pott: "Das Hoffen im neuen Testament." 1915, 203 p.

ravishingly beautiful, and no one had even been thought so powerful, wise, or good. And so he drew all who revered him closer together than men had ever stood before, and made them indifferent to all else save their captain's good will. To become one of his favourites was to gain all, and all man's gregarious herding instincts reached in his wake their highest culmination in and through him. This was a union that all outer ties can only typify or vicariate for.

Recent anthropological studies teach us that the primitive self was not the individual but the group, and that the former emerged very gradually out of the latter. Primitives knew no barriers between one another, or even between themselves and nature. The *ego* could change into the *alter*. There was not only contagion of qualities but metamorphosis of character. This was peculiarly the case among members of the same totem clan. Within these self may be acquired, lost, or changed with increased facility. In the closest social groups members were so knit the one to the other that if one suffered all did. If one sinned all did, and any other member might be punished as in blood revenge. Possession and regeneration involved acquiring another soul. Virtue could be transferred by a touch or magically. All this concourse, exchange, fusion, or circulation of soul or self was mediated by some Mana-like principle which underlay all conditions and was the medium of such changes. Now the Kingdom was a spiritual and restricted totem group in which each was, had, did nothing for himself alone, but lived, moved, thought, felt, acted, and had his being in the whole. Those who came into the Kingdom thereby changed their souls. Peter and Paul even changed their names. The exalted Christ was thus their totem head. He was born or formed anew in each, and each was reborn into him. Thus the primitive Kingdom was founded. It was invisible and not made with hands, long before it grew into the visible Church. Out of this fusion of individual souls all the institutions, doctrines, ordinances, offices, buildings, rites of the Church, later evolved. All these, however, belong to a third stage of the development of the Kingdom which Jesus never knew or presaged. He had experienced in his own person the first stage in the genesis of the Kingdom before his ministry began. It embraced the second stage of organizing those who had found salvation by knitting their souls up indiscerptibly with his own person and through it with one another. The third stage, begun by Peter and Paul after Jesus' death, is not yet

ended. We must not disparage totemism as a principle for all that rises high strikes its roots deep into the past. As a system it has long since ceased to exist in the consciousness of cultured races, and there were some but faint ostensive traces of it among the Jews in Jesus' day. But it is still potent beneath the threshold of the human soul in its instinctive autistic nature and depths, and when we feel the closest of all human ties we turn not merely in poetry but in prose to its terms, for it was the mediator of the most intimate fraternization through countless ages. Indeed it so long represented the closest of all relations between men, and was so long the hieroglyph of the culmination of man's gregarious instincts, that although now obsolete and absurd as a system, it still lives deep in the heart, and its vestiges and scattered phrases in the Fourth Gospel are still valid and work their magic in us. Could we see more clearly into the subconscious psyche, we should realize that the old metamorphoses of personality and reidentification with a sovereign Lord of the higher life and mind of man are still very active processes within us.

All Jesus' moral and social teachings followed naturally from two major premises: first, the end is at hand, and second, there must be a general merger of the individual in the whole in which the partnership is unlimited and without reservation. From these data it is plain how little respect there could be for differences of station, and how Jesus must have abhorred over-individuation and all that favoured it, such as power, fame, pleasure, and wealth. Let us select the latter as typical and see how severely conditioned his views were upon the two above premises, and therefore how fatuous it is to attempt to apply this typical line of his social teachings to modern conditions. To do so we should have to revert to a totemic community and be convinced that mundane affairs were about to end. Hence Jesus' teaching here as elsewhere was *ad interim*.[1] In this very close and temporary fraternity no man must call anything his own. There must be a communistic sharing of all with all. No one was worthy who loved anything or anybody more than him. The rich young man was a paragon of every virtue, but his wealth barred him from the Kingdom, which was as hard to enter as a needle's eye. The land was rich, the people industrious, but most were in bitter poverty by reason of extortion. Jesus was

[1]See G. D. Huever: "The Teachings of Jesus Concerning Wealth." Chicago, 1903. C. Rugge: "Der erdischer Besitz im neuen Testament." Also Edersheim: "Sketches of Jewish Social Life in the Days of Christ." London, 1876, 342 p. Marquand: "Staatsverwaltung." Here Peabody is best.

reared in poverty, his disciples were poor, and all were below the middle class, which Aristotle thought the most favourable. On entering his ministry Jesus and his followers had left behind their means of sustenance, and they seem to have known hunger, cold, scantiness of attire, and homelessness. When the disciples were sent forth to preach, they were forbidden to take any provision for their own maintenance, but must trust solely to spontaneous hospitality and must withdraw if this was not offered. Thus it is not strange that poverty became almost a muse to be wooed, that it was a test of admission to the Kingdom. Against the hell of want their only safeguard was faith in a heavenly provider, and they must make this the psychic equivalent of a modest life endowment. Their wants, too, must be reduced to a minimum, nor was this thought treason to the agencies of industrial production. No one can serve God and Mammon. From the parable of Dives and Lazarus we are left to infer that the former went to hell solely because he was rich, and the latter to heaven merely because he was poor. The Gospel was first proclaimed to the poor, and they seem to have been saved first and easiest. Nitti thinks poverty was an explicit and inexorable condition of membership in the Kingdom, and Leslie Stephens thinks the early Christians were almost nihilists in their rancour against property. Luke, whom Rugge calls the socialistic Evangelist, teaches that none who did not renounce all could become disciples. He alone records of the woes upon the rich, the parable of the rich man who boasted and was condemned for it; the lost penny; the unjust steward; the good Samaritan. He says the blessing is for the hungry, which Matthew records for those hungry for righteousness rather than for the poor in spirit. Luke makes Jesus say, "Give to every one," instead of "to him that asketh." He records the marriage feast to which the poor and defective were bidden. The Gospel injunction is if one asks a coat to give a cloak also. "Sell what thou hast and give alms." All must give, even the widow her mite. Those who give to the poor give or loan to the Lord, lay up treasure in heaven, etc. Renan regards the Gospels as essentially Ebionistic and pervaded by the view that none but the poor could be saved. Many if not most of the commands to give could not have been addressed to the esoteric circle, for those who had abandoned all would have nothing left to give, but were themselves the fittest to receive charity. Jesus' own maintenance and that of his disciples and his cause depended on the virtue

of benevolence which was so stressed, although we need not infer, as has often been done by critics, that he had a subtle and selfish though unconscious motive in magnifying this virtue to the uttermost. Paul said the Lord loved a cheerful giver, and believed in giving as freely as we have received. Pity, compassion, almsgiving, are perhaps best developed in Buddhistic lands like Burma, but Christianity sublimates *charitas* into generosity of thinking and feeling, which is something far above benevolence as a business, a virtue, or a science, all of which it now is. This involves the wise direction of sympathy, prefers a personal touch to the anonymity of a subscription paper, accepts datours and doles, even of ill-gotten wealth.[1] It seems as if Jesus' rancour toward the rich grew during his ministry. In the Old Testament property is a sign of Jehovah's favour, but in the New Testament woe is pronounced upon the rich as such. As Ruskin says, wealth is now illth. Fine raiment, sumptuous fare, houses, land, property, barns bursting with the harvest, all are deceitful, snares. Holtzmann says Jesus thought them perilous, Luke that he deemed them disgraceful. They choke the word. Love of money is the root of all kinds of evil. James calls on the rich to "weep and howl." Naumann calls Jesus an enemy of wealth and capital. Laveleye[2] says that if Christianity was taught according to Jesus' spirit, "the existing social order could not last a day." Herron says, "Jesus regarded industrial wealth as a moral fall and a social violence."

In view of the above it is disheartening to contemplate the vast body of literature which has accumulated since the great advance in industrialism and the coincident efforts of the Semitic writers, Marx and Lasalle, to make a radical speculative socialism a substitute for Christianity. Bebel, Bax, and Liebknecht teach revolt from the Church, which they hold has come to stand for private wealth, the worst of all monopolies. Hence God and "the semi-mythical Syrian of the first century" must be abolished, and the world reorganized without religion in a social democracy. Against this alienation of

[1] W. Rauschenbusch: "Christianizing the Social Order." New York, 1912, 493 p. Also his "Christianity and the Social Crisis." New York, 1908, 429 p. F. G. Peabody: "Jesus Christ and the Social Question." New York, 1912, 374 p. Also his "The Approach to the Social Question." New York, 1909, 210 p. W. E. Chadwick: "Social Relationships in the Light of Christianity." London, 1910, 344 p. R. J. Campbell: "Christianity and the Social Order." London, 1907, 284 p. H. F. Ward, ed.: "Social Ministry." New York, 1910, 318 p. C. R. Henderson: "Social Duties from the Christian Point of View." Chicago, 1909, 332 p. S. N. Patten: "Social Basis of Religion." New York, 1911, 247 p. J. H. Holmes: "The Revolutionary Function of the Modern Church." New York, 1912, 264 p. G. Harris: "A Century of Change in Religion." Boston, 1914, 266 p. F.,R. M. Hitchcock: "St. Augustine's Treatise on the City of God." Trans., London, 1900, 115 p. P. A. Kropotkin: "Mutual Aid as a Factor of Evolution." London 1902, 348 p.

[2] "Primitive Property." Introd. Trans. London, 1878.

industry from the Church arose a long series of efforts from Wichern and his "inner mission" in 1849 to Von Ketteler, De Mun, and Du Prey in the Catholic Church and Maurice and Kingsley in England, who sought to humanize economic principles and methods and to put co-operation in place of competition. Thus we have two socialisms, one Christian and the other anti-Christian. Meanwhile a great effort has been spent in minimizing and explaining away Jesus' sayings concerning wealth, as if it were necessary to apologize to him for the wealth both of and in the Church. We are reminded that he was a friend of the rich publican Zaccheus; that he taught the increase of each man's talent; said that to him that hath will be given. We are told that a Christian may be rich if he masters and is not mastered by wealth; that Jesus said nothing against trusts; that property begins in the animal world, etc. Why not frankly admit that it is as preposterous to go to Jesus for economic as it would be for scientific wisdom? Everything indicates that his views of property and industry were hardly less crude and negligible than those he held concerning astronomy. In this domain he was more ignorant than the crudest modern tyro and most of his sayings should be left to the oblivion they deserve. What he said and his followers practised was due to conditions hardly less exceptional and transient than the enforced rules laid down on a doomed ship. What could he know of the new worths and values wealth creates, absorbed as he was with the idea of merging the individual in the group, and in eradicating selfishness in all its forms during the brief time that remained? Of course he would have abominated modern predatory wealth; but he was no socialistic communist or anarchist in any modern sense. In wise discrimination, present-day teachings and even the best of the ancient moralists are better guides than Jesus. Were we to take his precepts in this field literally and apply them, modern society would be reduced to the level of the totemic clan, living for the day, improvident and absorbed in dreams of a new paradise supernaturally inaugurated. Jesus foresaw neither the Church, science, modern industrialism, law, courts, nor medicine, and had no conception of statecraft. But he did see, as no one before or since has seen, the principle of service and mutuality, which is the psychogenetic basis of true success in all these domains. Although we must forget and often negate his specific teachings, we can and must find for ourselves ways and

means of applying his spirit in all these fields; and thus only can we make all of them truly Christian. To him we owe simply the crude but inspiring ideal and impulsion. The work must be all our own.

The early Church groped its way to two expressions of the ultimate relations of the ideal man to the race and to the cosmos back of it, which are expressed respectively in the doctrine of incarnation and that of the *parousia*. The first means in modern terms that not merely in Hegelian sense does God come to consciousness in the ideal man; for the theanthropic state of the soul must forever transcend the consciousness of any individual, and personality itself necessarily involves limitations. It means, rather, that the type-man whose life is impelled by the maximum momentum at the centre of the evolutionary stream, feels, thinks, and acts as normally, and especially as generically, as is possible for a single human individual. In so doing he incarnates what Hegel called the pure idea, Fichte the absolute ego, Schopenhauer the will to live, Spencer the developmental *nisus*, Bergson the creative *élan vital*, Freud and Jung the primordial *libido*, Janet the impulse to perfection, or wholeness (which is holiness), Adler the horror of mediocrity or inferiority in the impulse to attain *Geltung*, etc. This is the prime impulse of life and heredity, which pleasure normally advances and pain and disease tend to inhibit, the arrests of which make what we call consciousness, which is always remedial, causes all neuroses and psychoses, and brings death sooner or later to all. This great impulse toward more intense larger human life the soul responds to even in its aberrations. Most that constitutes life slumbers in us from birth to death because the vaster life of the race lies so largely below the threshold of consciousness and rarely breaks through the barriers that bar the phyletic from the ontogenetic life. This means heredity, which is well called from God, for every formulation of the background of existence, whether it stops at the human stage or goes back to the ulterior source of life in general or still further back to the great autos we call the cosmos or to the pantheistic mother lye, being, cosmic gas, protyle, or whatever its name—these are what man has always called divine. Recession or reversion toward this, whether it be back to a prime principle underlying the universe or to some proximate stage of development, is recession, or religion in the best etymological sense of that word, because it revives or releases genetic

impulsions. Of this the old word, "incarnation," is a still adequate and pregnant symbol.

The "second coming" is less psychogenetic than moral for it expresses the ineluctable conviction that sometime, somewhere, virtue and happiness on the one hand and sin and misery on the other will get together, as they should, as justice demands. This conviction Kant thought created and kept alive the belief in a transcendent world. Thus every drama and novel which in the end metes out desert justly is a petty *parousia* and keeps alive the selfsame instinct which found expression in this doctrine. It is one of the chief glories of Jesus that this eschatological *dénouement* was believed in so fervently by him that he felt impelled to find relief for the inner tension of his soul about it by having recourse to even the wild weird tropes and metaphors of Daniel and the apocryphal imagery, and that to him it seemed as real as it did to the author of the Book of Enoch. The awful apparition of justice in a final day of judgment haunted this most fervently ethical of all the souls in history. *Fiat justitia, ruat cœlum et terra.* Then only can the Kingdom come. Jesus' soul was so surcharged with the flush of creative evolution that it was like a battery with such a voltage of electric tension that discharge was inevitable, defective as were the conductors, so that its heat and light can still be felt in the fantastic dreameries about the catastrophic advent of heaven to reward the good and of hell to punish the bad. To the passionate moralist earth needs nothing so much or so immediately as a judge who is wise enough to perceive desert, and powerful enough to mete out to all according to their merits. The agonizing cry of his soul is, "Why does the day of justice not come!" Belief that it impends effects the most thorough of all purgations of soul. All who deem this a moral universe hold that biological laws or the perhaps yet slower course of history will sometime vindicate justice, even though it require ages of natural selection acting on individuals, families, and nations to do it. But in Jesus' temperament the processes of this conviction found a short-circuit, and the detonation was sudden, here, and now. All future history lost perspective as temporal remoteness was foreshortened into the present. Thus the *parousia* is anticipation by the same psychic mechanism that evolution is revelation. As in the Incarnation we command the resources of the past of the race and the world, so in the *parousia* Jesus strove to teach us to command the resources of the

future by vividly presentifying the far-off results and issues of human destiny.[1]

Thus the *parousia*-idea is to us a kind of parable made, not like other parables, consciously, but by Jesus' autistic nature. To fully understand it we must get back of what he said about it to what he meant by this highly symbolic complex. We err if we try to accept it literally, even though he probably meant to be thus understood. Here we have a motif which we must interpret. Theology has piously conserved but failed to understand it. Romance, as we saw in Chapter 2, has often, although very feebly, tried to bring Jesus or some figure representing him into modern life in a way to make his moral power felt by those who came in contact with him. The range of this principle far transcends these puny efforts, but it should be a most inspiring incentive to the creative imagination.

Kenosis is another pregnant theme for religious psychology. All the Yahveh of Isaiah and the major prophets did not find embodiment in Jesus, for the former was too vast for all the plenitude of his attributes, infinity in time and space, creativeness, omnipotence, to be manifested in any single son of man. Nor is it all a matter of logical extension *versus* intention; nor is it the case of a generalized type-form of animal like the *patrofelis*, with more generic and less specific types than any of the species that sprang from it; nor is it exactly illustrated by the processional of growth of an adult out of Wordsworthian childhood, who, as he develops, loses many of the traits of the genus in acquiring those of the individual. These are only analogues of kenosis. The great achievement wrought by Christianity of casting man's ideas of the divine into a specific, unipersonal, human form did, but should not, make us forget the greater God of all nature, animate and inanimate. It is excessive anthropomorphization of religion that has caused its tragic age-long warfare with science. The substance of the Godhood that did not and could not all go over into Jesus the Christ is still worthy of adoration and service. This overplus was the Deity

[1] In his very ingenious and stimulating "The Master of Modern Evolution" (1911, 135 p.) G. H. MacNish represents heredity and adaptation as the two chief factors of life, illustrating how now one and now the other dominates in history and in individuals. One is racial, and the other individual. The first makes for conservatism, is favoured by aristocracies and pride of birth, is cultivated by meditation, by which the individual may break through the "screen" of William James, and is illustrated in the conservatism of the Catholic Church and in stable states and societies generally. The other is marked by an overplus of the individual element that innovates reforms, brings in the new, etc. Jesus he conceives as marking the climax of evolution, bringing in not only a new but a higher degree of life; conserving yet revising the old in the light of the new; controlling nature and man, yet no less a paragon of adjustment. He desired all to become children in the sense of going back to the old unity with self and kind, chose for his cabinet disciples of the most opposite traits, and harmonized them. He kept the "screen" open so that he could command all the latent resources of his soul and that of the race and the world to which he ever harked back, and which he could summon at will. He was a master at adjusting antagonistic forces. Because it was inner, the union that he brought into the world was wider, closer, and more lasting than the empires of force set up by Caesar and Alexander.

that Jesus himself adored. Indeed, it is only the pathetic *Enge des Bewusstseins* on our part that makes us think that to be truly Christian we should know and serve Jesus only. It needs no very profound psychoanalysis to show that the most devout of all Jesus' disciples from the beginning to our day make him the chief but never the only divinity that they worship. The germs of all the old faiths still live in us all, and alas for Christianity if they were not there! We might as well try to extirpate the scores of rudimentary organs in our body as to eliminate these. We must not only revere the Most High of the Psalms and Prophets, but what large and true Christian heart does not warm to the pantheistic sentiment of the great poets and philosophers and feel the lure of the best that is in all the great ethnic Bibles? Otherwise why do or can we study comparative religions? Children in their plays and toys, and adults in the charms and ornaments they wear, are fetish-worshippers, and under stress of feeling we all become primitive animists. Thus there has never been a complete kenosis of any of the antique or transcended faiths and cults into Christianity. The aesthetic feelings still worship the blue vault above, the heavenly bodies, clouds, rain, lightning, wind, water, fire, trees, flowers, and animals. Each of these has at some time or place long been the very highest object of the religious instincts, and alas for us if these vestiges are rooted out from our souls! We have thought too meanly of Man-soul. It has many mansions, and it is enough if we keep the best of these sacred to the God of our Scriptures. Only in the cruder past did the new God evict, diabolize, or slay his predecessor. No man can be Christian in the sense too usually required with more than a safe working majority of his faculties. In his attitude of filial piety toward Yahveh and the Hebrew cult Jesus gave the world the truest and loftiest paradigm of how a new should succeed an old religion; and this suggests that the true missionary should be chiefly intent upon revealing the new that lies concealed in the old religion, but which he is to minister to just as Jesus did, and as only a very few of the great Catholic missionaries have ever attempted.[1] Perhaps no one now living worships Zeus, once supreme father of gods and men, yet the study of this cult enriches the religious life of every classicist. Thus no kenosis ever was or can be complete. Modern pragmatism has not rightly observed the principle of kenosis with reference to the older metaphysics and the

[1] See "Missionary Pedagogy" in my "Educational Problems." 1911, vol. 2, chapter 10.

philosophy of the absolute which it would supersede. Every teacher of the history of philosophy may have his own preferences, and even his own system; but if the latter interferes with his sympathy with any one of all the serious efforts from Thales to Bergson that men have made to comprehend the universe, he ceases to be a worthy or even efficient representative of his own standpoint. Indeed, Christianity from the very first has been a masterpiece of syncretism, and owes its marvellous spread largely to the fact that it has given back to all men a revised and enriched version of what they all had. No old religion that went over to it did so wholly. Converts who ostentatiously and enthusiastically burned their idols in so doing still continued to invest the new faith with the old religious feelings transferred to new objects, for nothing is so transferable as affectivity.[1]

[1] I have found help in this chapter by following among others, Robert Law: "The Emotions of Jesus." T. & T. Clark, 285 p. A. Schlatter: "Die christliche Ethik." Calw. u. Stuttgart, 1914, 386 p. G. S. Painter: "The Philosophy of Christ's Temptation." Boston, 1914, 333 p. Dn. Völter: "Jesus der Menschensohn oder Das Berufsbewusstsein Jesu." Strassburg, 1914, 113 p. Konst. Gutberlet: "Der Gottmensch Jesus Christus; eine Begründung und Apologie der kirchlichen Christologie." Regensburg, 1913, 325 p. E. D. La Touche: "The Person of Christ in Modern Thought." London, 1912, 416 p. E. H. Merrill: "Person of Christ." Bibliotheca Sacra Co., 1910. J. W. Berg: "Das Leben und Leiden Jesu Christi." Caspar, 1915. S. C. Tapp: "Why Jesus Was a Man and Not a Woman." 1914. Sidney C. Tapp, 406 Reliance Bldg., Kansas City, Mo. W. J. Lhamon: "Character Christ." Revell, 1914. E. W. Serl: "Laughter of Jesus." Neale, 1911. E. D. Wright: "Psychology of Christ." Cochrane Pub., 1909. A. Whyte: "Our Lord's Character." Revell. C. H. Barrows: "Personality of Jesus." Houghton, 1906. J. Smith: "Magnetism of Christ." Doran. C. E. Jefferson: "Character of Jesus." Crowell, 1908. T. Hughes: "Manliness of Christ." Altemus. H. Bushnell: "Character of Jesus." Scribner. P. Schaff: "Person of Christ." Am. Tract, 1913. Friedrich Daab: "Jesus von Nazaret." Düsseldorf, Langewiesche, 1907, 224 p. Karl Weidel: "Jesu Persönlichkeit; eine psychologische Studie." Halle, Marhold, 1908, 47 p. Johannes Ninck: "Jesus als Charakter; eine Untersuchung." 2d rev. ed. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1910, 396 p.

CHAPTER SEVEN

JESUS' ESCHATOLOGY, HIS INNER CHARACTER, PURPOSE AND WORK

The founders of the eschatological view—Relations of psychology to Christology—Jesus' diathesis, which was essentially ecstatic—Jesus' great change of plan and the causes of the "quest for death"—Contact with the great ethnic religions of death and resurrection of divine personages based on seasonal changes—Jesus' "passion for secrecy"—The pathos of his death found in the fact that he believed this second plan a failure and that there was to be no sequel—In what sense did Jesus rise and return?—His futurism—The reinforcements of the moral sense by the expectation of an end of the world—The psychology of death—In what sense was Jesus great?—(A) The standard of being discussed—(B) That of experiencing both extremes of pleasure and pain—(C) Alternations between the subjective and objective life or between solitude and society—(D) Belief of being influenced by some power above self—(E) That they are generic type or totemic men—(F) Combining pairs of opposites like conservative and progressive, calmness and enthusiasm, imagination and common sense—Necessity of new and higher conceptions of Jesus if his power is to be maintained in the world—(1) He felt superior to others and closer than any one else had been to God—(2) He concealed this dominant sense of inner deity—(3) This brought the higher tension of opposites in his soul—Such a being must necessarily move far up and down the algedonic scale, and love and hate more than others—The psychology of inspiration—Jesus' death brought followers at first no glimmer of insight into what he was—The supreme miracle is how belief in Jesus' Resurrection arose and this psychology enables us now at least in part to understand and trace the development stages of this great affirmation—What is the Holy Ghost?—The psychology of the conversion of Paul and his dual nature—He knew little of Jesus save that he died and rose—Did he know the pagan cults of death and resurrection?—The psychology of Pentecost, the Ascension, and the apocalypse.

JESUS' eschatological conceptions have in recent decades come to be almost as important as the mythic problem itself, and views concerning them are no less opposite. Jesus' utterances on the subject were thought to be his own until the authenticity of the

apocalyptic documents was established. They showed that eschatology was a very prominent feature of his age, so that his own views, whatever they were, came to seem less new and original. The prophets thought the Messianic Kingdom belonged to the present world-order, while the apocalyptic representations in Jesus' own time made the Kingdom not only a future but a new order of things. T. Colani[1] held that Jesus at first sought only complete communion with God and nothing else, but as he proceeded in teaching the Kingdom his consciousness grew Messianic, and he expected it to come slowly by organic development and not by the way of a catastrophic *dénouement.* As his views on the Kingdom grew inward he came to accept the title of Messiah, which he could not do so long as he thought it material and Davidic. In accepting this view he also accepted the rôle of suffering which was integral to the very idea of Messianity, and he trusted that the effects of the Passion would establish the Kingdom. If it was spiritual the idea of a glorious second coming must be dropped. Hence the Jewish eschatology would have to be discarded save certain natural symbolic allusions to it. We must therefore eliminate passages which teach the speedy spread of the Kingdom among the gentiles, and also the idea of a preliminary judgment because of men's lack of receptivity. Most of Matthew xxiv and Mark xiii, as well as much of Luke xxi must thus be regarded as unauthentic interpolations. Jesus never expected to return from heaven to finish his work. That was finished by his death. We can never, however, entirely explain Jesus' preaching on these points from the history of his time. Thus Colani completely rejects eschatology, although he would do so only by textual analysis and criticism.

Later G. Volkmar[2] took up the problem, resting all authentic knowledge on Mark, which he dated 73 A. D., five years after the Book of Revelations was written. Matthew for him is a tertiary compilation and so Volkmar's effort to eliminate eschatology was made easy, for he had only Mark to deal with. The contemporary ideas of Messianity were such that Jesus could not possibly have claimed it. The concept of a spiritual Kingdom came later. In Jesus' time only the political ideas of the Kingdom were known, and any one who awakened hopes of this kind would certainly share the fate of the Baptist. Jesus thus

[1] "Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps." Strassburg, 1864, 255 p.
[2] "Jesus Nazarenus und die erste christliche Zeit mit den beiden ersten Erzählern." Zürich, 1882, 403 p.

had to be a political Messiah, or none at all. Thus not only eschatology but Messianity is eliminated. Only after his death did Jesus become Christ. Peter's acclamation of him as the Messiah was only near the end of his career and anticipative of the effects of the Passion. Thus, after the excision of a few other passages, it appears that Mark, like Paul, thought that Jesus became Messiah only as a result of the Resurrection. Jesus' ethics were not confused by eschatological motives. In some places, nevertheless, the expectation of the *parousia* reached such a high pitch that marriage was thought useless. This, of course, would have shocked Jesus. The discourses about the end of the world and the second coming are later and for edification. Jesus' own view is found in the parables of sowing, the mustard seed, and of the permanence of his sayings. He never expected to come in the clouds. Ideas of the second coming Volkmar complains have been hitherto slighted or regarded as too delicate for discussion.

Weiffenbach[1] seeks to mediate between those who think that the *parousia* or the second coming formed an integral part of Jesus' teaching, and those, more in number, who hold that he was misunderstood by his disciples so far as they ascribed to him belief in any literal or sensuous form of it. He found a deadlock between these two views, and the way out that he sought was in the relation between the *parousia* and the Passion. He dissents from the view that Jesus' eschatological sayings acquired this character from the way in which they are combined, the component passages themselves having no trace of it. Nor does he hold that the little apocalypse (Matthew xxiv and Mark xiii) was broken up by irrelevancies in order to tone down expectation, since predictions of a second coming had not been fulfilled even after Jerusalem fell. Weiffenbach thinks Jesus did express the thought of his own near return, but did so moderately, and that Jewish-Christian eschatology amplified these sayings. The belief is waxing, not waning, in these chapters, and the disciples' hopes were too strong to be accounted for solely by current Jewish expectations; otherwise Jesus' teachings and the faith of primitive Christians are unexplained. If we eliminate all other predictments, Jesus' admonition at the Mount of Olives to watch though the hour was unknown, is the key to unlock and the standard by which to measure every other passage touching this subject. Proceeding, then, to test all other New Testament

[1] "Der Wiederkunftsgedanke Jesu." Leipzig, 1873, 424 p.

passages by this, we have as a result only a colourless and rather contentless thought of an early personal return. All that does not square with this authentic form can be rather ruthlessly eliminated. Jesus never thought of judging the world, and this function was never ascribed to the Messiah until later. He did not foresee the destruction of Jerusalem. His charge to the Twelve, so far as it implied a second coming, was an anachronism. The charge at the Last Supper is simply chiliastic. As his life drew toward its close, Jesus did express the hope of coming back, but, as the *parousia* was deferred, this became more and more embellished, and missionaries to the gentiles grew cautious about calling it near. He did not offer even to save Jerusalem from its fate, and so his return was put further and further into the future. This contentless expectation may prove the identity of the prediction of the *parousia* and of the Resurrection. The conduct of the disciples after the Resurrection shows that it had not been very clearly predicted. Both were connected with Jesus' death and both were expected about the same time; hence they were at first thought to be one and the same. Only after his death were the two differentiated. The Resurrection did not bring what the *parousia* had promised, but the eschatology he had dampened during his life now flourished very rankly.

Baldensperger[1] assumes that Jesus' conception of the Kingdom was dual. The spiritual and eschatological elements were equally strong and were also mutually conditioned. Thus Jesus began with the purpose of founding an invisible Kingdom, but expected that it would be realized miraculously. Hence Jesus' consciousness was in some sense double. His Messianic consciousness was a special form of the sense of unique relation to God. This had power to transform the Jewish Messianic self-consciousness, although perhaps the latter was itself religious in Jesus as was his unique sense of union. Thus for him the term "Son of Man" would have both an apocalyptic and also an ethical and religious sense. This dual self-consciousness of Jesus Baldensperger explains genetically and historically. At the start eschatology affected Jesus' expectation of the Kingdom and his Messianic consciousness. After the latter arose at the baptism, he rejected the ideal of a Davidic or warring king, and began to found a Kingdom by preaching. Thus for a time a spiritual Kingdom was his ideal and the Messianic

[1] "Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit." Strassburg, 1888, 193 p.

eschatology faded, or he was silent about it, perhaps for pedagogic reasons, fearing a political movement by his followers, which the Roman rule would crush. His other reasons for not revealing his Messianity vanished when he had deliberately decided to die and return in the clouds. Until then he knew not when or how the Kingdom would come. Until Peter's confession the disciples had only the haziest ideas of his Messianity. This was the preparatory period of waiting and watching. For him it was a period of acute struggle between his religious conviction of his Messianity and the old national ideals of this office. In the second period he became clear and harmonious. By accepting suffering his inner peace became ineluctable, great and deep, for now he knew when and how God would fulfil his promises. It would be with the second coming of the Messiah. Now he was Son of Man and judge of the world. Would the people accept him as Messiah? To determine this he went to Jerusalem, and at first they acclaimed him with great heartiness; but later when they saw that he did not and could not fulfil their ideas, the reaction came and was so great that in it he lost his life. The sensation that Baldensperger's book caused was due to the fact that it so diametrically opposed preceding opinions on the subject, by assuming that Jesus had a well-developed eschatology instead of none.

J. Weiss'[1] solution of the problem is strongly pro-eschatological. The Kingdom, which is the key to the problem, has no likeness to any other, in that it is entirely futuristic and so in a sense supermundane. The best index of its advance is the waning of Satan's kingdom, and hence Jesus cast out devils. Jesus merely proclaimed it just as the Baptist had done, except that Jesus knew that he was the Messiah; but he exercised none of the functions of the office, but simply waited for God to bring in the Kingdom supernaturally. He sent out the disciples to preach its nearness, but he did not know its date although he believed it near. But as obstacles accumulated, he realized that it must be more remote than he had thought, and at length saw he must die before it came, and as a *conditio sine qua non* to its advent. He realized that he must die not merely for his own little group but for many. This depressive foresight of his demise was, however, more or less compensated for by a conviction that he would return glorified in the sense that, since Daniel, men had expected the Messiah to come.

[1] "Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes." Göttingen, 1900, 2d ed., 214 p.

These great ideals not only consoled him for, but enabled him to triumph over, death. He was to come thus gloriously, and very soon, and justify to his friends before they died his predictions of the Kingdom. The judgment day was to precede. The Kingdom was transcendental enough not to arouse political fears, yet it was by no means merely within the soul. Its ethics was of a kind to make men free from this world, and hence it is mainly negative and penitential. The sense of Messianity to which he awoke at the baptism was not a present affair, but a future though assured potentiality. Here and now Jesus is only a man and a prophet. Son of Man is a purely eschatological term, although it is not clear whether his disciples thought it referred to his present state or his future rank, or thought it designated another person. Thus the Messianic self-consciousness of Jesus as expressed in the title, Son of Man, shares in the transcendental apocalyptic character of Jesus' idea of the Kingdom of God and cannot be separated from it. Jesus' eschatology was thus quite primitive and constitutive. By accepting suffering he "emerged from passivity."

The most extreme eschatologist is A. Schweitzer.[1] He holds that Jesus and most of the other New Testament writers were possessed if not obsessed by the idea that the world was to end before their death. In this we have the key to explain the epistles and especially the Gospels in a way which must profoundly modify our conceptions of Jesus' views, and which has been called "the last word" in the higher criticism. Condemning all current liberal and orthodox views alike, Schweitzer tries to show that about all that Jesus said and did was prompted by a dominant and ever-present conviction that the world-order was to come to an early and sudden end. The impending change was to be by a miraculous intervention of God. When Jesus sent out the Twelve he fully expected the *parousia* to occur before they returned. The persecutions and tribulations foretold were immediate and for them, and had no reference to later troubles, for the very existence of a Church was never dreamed of by Jesus. All the calamities he foretold were to befall them on this trip, and they were exhorted to endure to its end. Before they came back the Son of Man would have come. To Jesus' consternation they came back safe and sound.

[1] "Das Messianitäts- und Leidens-Geheimnis; eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu." Leipzig, 1901, 109 p. His view is revised in his "Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung." 2. Aufl., 1913. See Kap. 15, 16, and especially 21. See also Tyrrell's "The Church at the Cross-Roads," for a fairly good English presentation of Schweitzer's views and C. W. Emmet's "The Eschatological Question in the Gospels." London, 1912, 237 p.

Hence, after a little new orientation, he abandoned his promising work of heralding the Kingdom in Galilee, and fled to the north "in order to escape his followers who dogged his footsteps" to be with him when the Kingdom should break forth upon the world. From this crisis on we hear no more of the suffering of the elect, but only of Jesus himself. The Jewish apocalyptists of whom Jesus became the chief exponent all expected tribulation as "birthpangs" of the Messiah, but conceived him as above and aloof from it. It was with this heavenly being that Jesus had in his first period come to identify himself, but now he realized not only that he must suffer but that he must suffer and die alone. He must enter upon a "quest of death" for the benefit of others as a *conditio sine qua non* of the advent of the Kingdom. Now he came to regard himself as the future Messiah. In his present earthly life, however, he was merely a proclaimer and preparer, and it was an anxiously guarded secret that he was the future King and judge of the world. He was displeased when Peter revealed the secret of his Messianity to the rest of the Twelve. It leaked out again, however, involuntarily in the ecstasy described as the Transfiguration. Jesus went to Jerusalem solely in order to die there. If he taught there it was only to provoke the rulers to slay him. Clearing the temple and denouncing the Pharisees, in which his Messianic consciousness again broke through, were really to the same end. The entry to and all that he did in Jerusalem were Messianic for him, but were not so for the people, who only thought him a prophet. The synoptists here and often elsewhere represent Jesus as playing with his great secret. The question of the high priest, however, showed, to Jesus' surprise, that he had in some way come into possession of this secret. In fact, Judas had told him, and this constituted the act of betrayal which the story of the kiss merely masks. Thus Jesus died because two of his disciples had betrayed his secret, first Peter to the rest, and later Judas to the high priest. Jesus, too, admitted it, so that there should be the two witnesses required for his condemnation. The people, who had been subtly informed of his claim, no longer held him to be a great prophet, as they did when he entered the city, but now deemed him a fanatic. The end of all we know about Jesus was that he was crucified, and the last we ever shall hear of him was his cry of despair at being forsaken.

In developing the above conclusions Schweitzer has no use for John or even for Luke, and condemns Mark for knowing nothing of any

struggle or any development in Jesus' soul; for being without intelligence as to the meaning of his entry to Jerusalem; for being unable to distinguish between the early period of success and the later one of failure. He otherwise discredits the Second Gospel, but on the whole thinks himself a justifier of Gospel tradition because he both puts out of and puts into the Scriptures far less than his predecessors on the eschatological line had done. According to his view, Jesus was reared in an atmosphere charged to the saturation point with eschatological ideas, and in his ministry he "sealed" those to whom entrance to the Kingdom could be guaranteed. Baptism thus came to predestine the elect to salvation. Feeding, too, was an eschatological sacrament. Those who shared Jesus' table in obscurity would do so in glory. This sacrament was really unique, for it worked quite independently of the understanding of the communicants. The phrases about binding and loosing are thus authentic and pregnant. Schweitzer interprets the apocalyptic language of Jesus, not as imagery or symbol but as all of it crude, literal, and material. The ethics of Jesus was all of it *ad interim* morals. As the old world is just about to end people may give away coat and cloak, take no thought for the morrow, and there is no need of loving parents, etc. Jesus is no great moral teacher, because salvation and damnation are all predestined; but he was so preoccupied with impending other-worldness, on which he wished all to fix their souls, that his ethical teaching was quite incidental. Thus the whole history of Christianity is based on the delay of the *parousia* and its progress is measured by the degree of de-eschatolization. Schweitzer thus eliminates what was basal in the founder's mind. He died in the despair of disillusion and with a sense of absolute failure. But in his death eschatology bore to the world a marvellous child, viz., the early Christian doctrine of literal, not to say physical, immortality. This new religion of immortality took the place of the old decaying civilizations. The problem of just how this narrow and extreme apocalyptic consciousness motivated the supreme world religion now opens before us, but it is yet unsolved. The Jesus this view gives us is not a figure to whom we can ascribe our own ideals, nor is he one from whom the early Church can fairly be said to have fallen away, but he is rather a person we cannot understand. Indeed "perhaps the best knowledge of the personality and life of Jesus will not be a help but rather an offence to religion" (p. 633). Still, great energy sprang from this

unprecedented consciousness with its great oscillation between life-affirmation and life-negation. Jesus was the great renouncer, passing from the greatest hope to the nadir of despair. Schweitzer's Jesus, however, is far less "reduced" than the Jesus of Harnack and of the many liberal critics, of most of whom he is the conspicuous opponent. The Christ of this eschatology, though never until now understood or even dreamed of, looms up far above the highest ranges of humanity as thus far known. The Jewish apocalyptists felt that God had failed, and the world as it was was lost, and so he must intervene and make it over. With the Jewish history and temper this was a natural, if not inevitable, result of centuries of thwarted hopes. It was obsession with this idea that drove Jesus to his death and despair. The problem how Christianity evolved from this, which, despite Schweitzer's protest, is a purely psychological one, he does very little to solve, so that it still challenges us. Until this is explained his whole conception, original and stimulating as it is, must remain in suspense with doubt predominant.

In response to these eschatological views we feel justified in the following: (a) It is grossly false to exclude psychological interpretations from this field, as some critics so vehemently do. On the contrary, the whole progress of recent critical studies of Christianity has consisted largely in emancipating it from merely textual criticism and historical research. The certain data are so meagre, gappy, and contradictory, that psychology must, even more than it has of late, become henceforth our chief guide. Most other sources are exhausted, and whether we wish or know it, we are now confronted by problems that only better knowledge of the laws of the human soul and better application of those already known can hold out any valid hope of solving. In fact, the Jesus problems have already become, some solely and all increasingly, those of psychology or of the higher anthropology, and we can distrust either the sincerity or the knowledge of all experts in the field who deny this. That it has been so long ignored or excluded here has been the great calamity, and that it is now in order is the brightest hope, of the Christianity of the present and the future. Jesus' mission was to save souls, and he was the world's master pragmatic psychologist, all intuitively and for the most part unconsciously, none the less but rather more so because he was so unintrospective and acted and spoke so predominantly from out of the depths of his uniquely rich and deep autistic nature, as we shall point out later.

Henceforth our motto must become *bonus psychologus, bonus Christologus*, for if there are next steps impending and inevitable, the psychology of the large, genetic, and analytic-synthetic type will be the necessary prerequisite for taking them. Already those who have done most and best in this field have used psychological data, methods, or principles, though often unaware of it, and without technical training in this discipline.

(b) The first step in the psychological evaluation of the eschatological movement as above outlined is plain enough. The history and diathesis of the Jewish mind being what they were, the eschatological movement was inevitable. Revering a deity whose chief attribute was that he loved justice and hated iniquity, and whose interventions in human affairs had always been in behalf of justice, to see that the good were rewarded and the bad punished—a God who both in external affairs and in the souls of men was always struggling with Satan although vastly more powerful than his adversary, so that if he chose he could at any moment put forth his might for disciplinary or any other unknown purpose—it was inevitable that the devotees of such a God should believe that in his own good time he would arise in his might, sweep away all evil, and establish an order of things after his own will. He could do it, for only a few score generations ago he had created all things out of nothing and pronounced them good. Why he who brought his favourites out of Egypt and gave all the riches of Palestine into their hands, who had guided the patriarchs, had nevertheless permitted the captivities and the other calamities that had befallen his chosen, was hard to explain. For centuries, whenever disaster came, his worshippers had been inclined to take the blame upon themselves, and at every misfortune had followed the lead of the prophets and examined their own hearts and lives to find out the hidden sin there. They had a fixed idea, older than the days of Job, that tribulation was sent and was meant as punishment, so that they must either confess sin and do penance for it or else accuse God of injustice, rob him of his cardinal attribute, and make him a being to be cursed instead of trusted. If, on the other hand, and in so far as, they felt their sufferings undeserved, there was but one alternative—to renounce Yahveh or to trust that he would right things in the future. Because they did the latter the future became a palladium ever fuller of hopes deferred, and they became more and more uniquely the people of the

promises. They lived on expectations, and made ever heavier drafts upon the bank of futurity. This went on for generations. Yahveh was the embodiment of their own strong racial soul which would not be overwhelmed by any series of disasters. A weaker or less persistent stirp would have given up and renounced their allegiance, but this they could not do, and so the tension between a sense of their own merits and their fate grew ever greater. The world about them became worse. The wicked flourished and the good suffered, yet God was still on his throne, and inscrutable as was his delay he surely could not long put off coming for recompense. Thus the prophetic mood acuminated and gradually passed over in certain eager nervous souls into the apocalyptic consciousness. The state of mind of Daniel and Ezekiel was revived in the wild welter of words and images of Enoch, and the conceptions of III Esdras and Baruch were revived. The date of the culmination thus came ever nearer. The awful *dies irae* and the new dispensation, the conquest and binding of Satan, were just at hand. The wicked would meet their doom, the righteous shine forth in a great and terrible compensation, and beatitudes would be realized for the worthy, in whose souls joy would reign in a new world purged of iniquity and all defilement. A new paradise of wish-fulfilment would take the place of the present sin-sodden world, in contemplating the imagery of which some minds grew ecstatic. Every promise and prophecy was on the very point of fulfilment. The lowly would be exalted and the high brought down. We deem the modern Adventist unbalanced or insincere, or both, but under the conditions of that era no conviction could have been more sincere. Rather it was a struggle between the soundest and most vigorous moral sense on the one hand, and wonted thought processes on the other, in which the former triumphed. Never was there such utter abandonment to the ethical instincts. Eschatology was a saturnalia of justice, the apotheosis of reformatory zeal, although men had simply to wait and look on while the power that makes for righteousness does its prophesied work in a new and higher creation, completing that of genesis. Thus by a process in the race-soul psychologically analogous to that in the victim of delusions of persecution who at last turns and instead of being persecuted becomes the persecutor, running amuck and wreaking terrible vengeance on those he fancies had wronged him,[1] so Yahveh at

[1] See V. Magnan: "Psychiatrische Vorlesungen." 1891-1894.

length will arouse himself and reëstablish justice in the world at dreadful cost to those who have so long and ever increasingly outraged it. Eschatology was thus the form which trust in divine goodness, when put under long and severe strain, had to take sooner or later.

If Weiss and Schweitzer are right, Jesus' consciousness during the first period of his ministry made him the consummate unipersonal expression of this inevitable attitude. If the existing order is just about to end in this way by God's intervention, nothing matters save righteousness. Wealth, station, social and political institutions and most human relations are negligible, and nothing is of worth that does not ensure entrance to the new Kingdom. All is suddenly seen *sub specie eternitatis* and there is radical transvaluation of all values, so that never was there such a basis of appeal to a new orientation and right perspective, to motives to do and be, and at short notice, the very best possible. No one ever had such a moral leverage upon the soul or the world, and nothing could have such transforming power over the minds and hearts of all who shared this conception, the discovery and reinstatement of which marks a great epoch in this field. It was a situation and an attitude impossible before or since. The world was a ship suddenly found to be fast sinking to perdition, with only a few who grasped the awful situation or observed implicitly the orders of the captain who had completely thought out the only conditions that could ever make a happy landfall on blissful shores.

(c) Granting that all this is normal psychodynamics, why should a few weeks' or even months' delay cause the whole long-incubated conception of Jesus to collapse? Why this sudden disillusion or bankruptcy of a faith on which so recently all had been staked? When or before the Twelve returned, Jesus, according to Schweitzer, had seen all this to be a dreadful mistake. The Lord would not presently come to rejuvenate the world. Jesus' whole scheme of things and his entire program had aborted. Was the motivation sufficient? Was the new idea that he must take upon his own person the tribulation that he had predicted for others a psychokinetic equivalent of the old idea? Was it germane for the prospect of dire disaster to others to pass so readily to the conception that he himself must bear it all and alone? Did he accept the rôle of suffering in any degree as a self-imposed penance for his mistake?

After the "quest for death" began why should there be any

secrecy about his Messianity? If we grant the great change in Jesus' plans as Schweitzer conceives it, its most probable objective cause was one to which he does not allude, viz., during or before the absence of the Twelve Jesus had learned something concerning the pagan conceptions of a dying god in the sense of Frazer, etc., and had passed in some sense and degree from the Jewish to the gentile conception of the way of salvation. He, like Paul, saw a great and new light, although a very different one. If a king, quasi-king, or god, like Osiris, Attis, Demeter, or Mithra, died originally in the fall to return in the spring, that was indeed better than that all or many should suffer. This may have suggested the new or greatly modified rôle. The Jewish ideas of vicarious offerings for ransom and atonement were now supplemented in Jesus' mind by those of the immolation of a royal or divine being. The ancient Jews were far beyond the old custom of human sacrifices, and Yahveh had long accepted bulls, rams, and even turtle-doves; but they knew nothing of offering up men of low or high degree, still less royalty, and least of all deities. But by the new turn of Jesus' thoughts his sense of self-divinity must have been greatly augmented along with his conception of his own worth and dignity. Such a being as he now deemed himself could die for many and they go free. The suffering servant of Yahveh is not offered up for others. He is only the personified soul of the race itself, and endures to the end, no matter how afflicted. Not so the old cult quests of the mystery religions of the lands bounding the eastern Mediterranean from Egypt around to Thrace. Jesus on this view found himself, we know not how, driven by a new culture current, more conformable to Paul's idea of vicarious atonement than to his own previous conception. His present new view, then, conforms not only to the Jewish but at many points even more closely to the old gentile religions which originated in nature worship; or rather it was a new synthesis, and hence of incalculably greater scope and efficiency.

The inner cause for Jesus' conversion from his first to his second plan, assuming this to have occurred, must have been that something had increased his certainty that he was the Messiah, and given a greatly enhanced sense of the dignity of this office. The greater he felt this and himself to be, the more effective would be his self-immolation. Perhaps this would account for his change to a "quest of death," without assuming discouragement over the results of the initial propa-

ganda of his followers. To consent to die is far more than to accept tribulation, and he may have felt that his psychalgia in doing the former was equal to the sum of that of many others who underwent affliction. Also, the more superman he felt himself to be, the greater the quantum of affliction necessary to quench his soul. Thus, with every addition to the sum total of affirmation of life and its negation, the larger the number of others his experience would exempt from the need of suffering. If he really deliberately provoked his enemies to kill him, one motive might have been thereby to enhance their guilt. Feeling himself divine, so that it would be a sacrilege to lay violent hands on him, every offence committed against his person would be vastly more heinous than if against a mere man who had none of this inviolability. Hence their punishment would be both greater and surer. It would provoke the Father to hurry the intervention of justice. To get himself abused and slain must arouse Yahveh to make an end of his delay and to come quickly to wreak vengeance on those who dared to do violence to his only Son. Perhaps Jesus felt that his extremity would afford the Lord not only an opportunity but an irresistible incentive to come quickly. Every new adversity on the way to death would be a new call to God to appear and stop the tragedy before the final scene. This is psychologically natural. But it was not done in a paroxysm of hate, suffering himself in order that his enemies might suffer more. It was rather a drastic and desperate appeal to the Father to delay no longer, but to arouse himself from his apathy and to bring in the Kingdom by giving to both good and bad their meet reward. But even this last desperate and pathetic appeal failed, and the awful tragedy proceeded to its fatal and pathetic end. Even if Jesus' course was not without a suggestion of patheticism, it was based on an invincible belief that the cosmos and its Lord were moral to the core. Perhaps the pathos of it was that he never dreamed, when he set his face toward Jerusalem and death, that he would be called on really to go on to the tragic end. On this view he must have died in the agony of utter despair, feeling that his sense of Messianity was a delusion. Still, although he felt forsaken he never renounced or denounced the Father so that there is no intimation that his faith in the ultimate coming of the Kingdom was weakened. It was only still further procrastination. So far, then, this interpretation conforms to psychological laws. All this might normally have happened, and it

is for textual criticism and history to determine whether or not it did actually occur here.

(d) Was there sufficient motivation for the passion for secrecy on the part of Jesus as to his conviction that he was the Messiah? Incomplete certainty would have been one motive, but his conviction, according to the eschatologists, was no less than plenary at the beginning of the second period, and then it was that he came nearest to betraying it. Before this it may not have been complete, and later he may have had moments of waning faith in himself. But why, during the time he felt surest of it, should he have hesitated to tell his intimates? Megalomaniacs often persistently tend to conceal their delusions of greatness from others, and it is only when they become pretty well fixed in their conviction of them that they speak of them openly. A king's son, reared among peasants, having just found out his royal parentage, might hesitate before revealing his newfound dignity to his humble companions. To do so might mean weakness and vanity, and might alienate his closest friends by inciting jealousy. It is impossible to explain Jesus' reticence on the subject without believing that he felt his disciples incapable of comprehending or sympathizing with his claims. He felt them to be vessels unfit for being repositories of his sacredly cherished secret. He could not take them into his confidence, much as he yearned to do so, because he felt them incompetent, untrustworthy, or perhaps both. He could tell them of a new and higher order of things, but not that he was the destined, though incognito, head of that Kingdom. They could help him prepare the way for it; but he whom they knew in daily intercourse—walking, talking, eating, and perhaps sleeping with them—dared not tell them that he was indeed the Christ. Paul, who knew him not in the flesh, could conceive him thus; but the disciples were too much like his parents and townspeople, and knew him too familiarly. This implied no flaws in his life, but only that he did not conform to their ideas of Messianity. They did not conceive it as so humble and simple. The disparity between his conception of it and theirs, though perhaps all the while slowly diminishing, was too great to be spanned by an open avowal without a shock involving obvious risks which he hesitated to take, although he was always striving to prepare them for it; not "playing" with it as Schweitzer says, but seeking to lead them toward it, step by step, without revealing to them his purpose to do so.

If they rejected it, their intimate relationships would be severed, while if they accepted it, the impetuous zeal or indiscretion of some of them might jeopardize all. They would be sure both to misconceive it and to blazon it abroad with no discretion as to fit time, seasons, or persons. Therefore it must remain double-locked in his own breast, somewhat as certain adult secrets are withheld from children both because they cannot really grasp their truth and because they would have no reserves in betraying them where they should not. When his secret led him to enter upon the road toward death, he was still less able to explain to them his new Messianic motives, for these were now much harder for them to understand. Jesus himself had just attained these new insights, and this step in advance greatly increased the distance between his point of view and theirs. They knew nothing of the gentile cults of dying and rising gods or culture heroes. This involved the entrance of a new and alien strain of cult and tradition. Moreover, they clung to him as their leader into the Kingdom, and the possibility of his death would fill them all with consternation, and so he had to remain unknown to them to the end. The transfiguration was a wish-dream symbolizing how different he would appear to his friends if they really had known him as he felt himself to be. The disparity between what they thought of him and what he thought of himself was great and growing, and he may have brooded much over it as a haunting and painful theme. It was also a sense of just this disparity, that came home to his followers after they thought him arisen, which constituted the psychological basis for the avidity with which the theological representations of his two states of humility and exaltation were accepted. "How familiar we were, yet how little we knew him," they must often afterward have mused. How this would reinforce their sense of the pathos of his end, how strongly such afterthoughts would tend to bring him back and prompt his friends to relive every item of memory or association with him, and how inevitably it would predispose them to react to the faintest hint or suggestion that he had survived or returned, and to cherish the slightest pretext for any such belief that could be found!

(e) Jesus died, on this view, thinking his second plan a more utter failure than the first had been, the most pitiable and unconsolable of all deaths in history. He had striven for the highest and sacrificed everything for nothing, as if he were God's fool and lunatic. His death

was not a deliberate suicide to save others, such as many heroes, known and unknown to fame, have committed. His motivation was purely soteriological, but his theory of forcing Yahveh's hand was insane and his method had proven absurd, and when he expired supernatural intervention seemed not nearer but further off, and more hopeless than ever. His attempt to take the Kingdom by force had failed, and very likely all hope that he would return in glory and judge the world was entirely extinct in his own soul, even though this was the last and most fondly cherished of his delusions. How, then, and in what way, did his grave become the cradle of the new Kingdom and of the Church that bears his name? It is just here that we find the most critical point of the eschatological scheme. Was it necessary that every scintilla of hope in Jesus' breast should die out in order to make his self-immolation complete? To have gone through the act of death knowing that he was merely sloughing off mortal habiliments to emerge at once in glory, would have involved no sacrifice but might have even been prompted by the crassest selfishness. This would be in the line of even animal instincts as old as impupation. Were this all he could have laughed death in the face and defied him to do his worst. Thousands of martyrs did this later, sustained only by the hope of personal resurgence into the heavenly Kingdom. We have long been taught by the Church that his death was the more bitter and tragic because he was divine; but with a plenary sense of his divinity and assurance of Resurrection his death was only a rôle and its pain at worst only a birth-pang. If, however, his sense of sonship itself was extinguished, he might have feared, if not extinction, the very torments of hell, for what else can the old and persistent belief that he went among the damned mean if not that he felt himself one of them? This sense must have been primal, and the interpretation of his supreme psychalgia on the cross as a visit to Hades, in order to preach to or rescue its inmates, was due to a later ambivalent swing of the pendulum over toward an optimistic interpretation of the most pessimistic of facts, all effected under the impulsion of the subsequent faith in the Resurrection. On this view Jesus, between the beginning of his second period and the moment of his death, passed all the way from full assurances of his Messianity down to the extreme "negative eudaimonism" of believing himself the one of all others most accursed of God. All the great affirmations that made him regarded as the resurrected Redeemer and

reinstated him so gloriously in the faith of the world as all that he ever thought himself to be when at the acme of his own belief in his Messianism came later. These were due to the reaction that took place in the souls of his chosen companions, headed by Peter, who was perhaps for a crucial moment the only believer in the Resurrection, but were reinforced later by a rapidly widening consensus that as early as Pentecost had developed to an almost cataleptic certainty.

The psychological root of the whole eschatological theory is whether the pathos of such a situation can be conceived of as so intense, so appealing to the individual and to the folk-soul as to compel both to react to it by affirming in the face of fact that (a) Jesus did overcome death and come back a victor over and not defeated by the Great Enemy, and that (b) Jesus' life-career had been planned beforehand and carried out with no change of purpose; that there was never a moment or a sign of doubt of his own divinity, and never a thought of any possible alteration of purpose.

Both these beliefs are the diametrical opposite of the truth in the case. In answer to the problem here presented we must remember how the fondest human wishes often tend to find or make modes of their realization almost in direct proportion as they are thwarted, and that even dreams that express the will to believe tend to be accepted as facts. Will and wish have thus often denied the most palpable facts and given the utmost reality to the most baseless fictions. But such tendencies could never have created *ex nihilo* all the great affirmations of Resurrection, Judgment, the Kingdom, etc., without a norm or modulus to give them current form and content. This must have been found in Jesus' own idea of himself and his work when his work was at its highest and best. The chief dynamic agent in this posthumous reaffirmation of the best that had been in him was pathos. This contributed, perhaps more than anything else, to make the first faint suggestion of his return pass so soon and rapidly up the scale of certainty to complete and triumphant assertion. The rest followed naturally, and made this conviction of Jesus that he was to return, but which he abandoned at the end, accepted along with his own highest valuation of himself. Thus, suppose that the stupendous miracle of the Resurrection actually occurred; the other no less stupendous psychological miracle would yet remain to be accounted for, viz., how men first came to believe in such a monstrous and absurd

thing, so contradictory to all human experience, and why belief in such a surd has been held to ever since with such pertinacity. Never had fate been so cruel to one so pure and innocent, perhaps beautiful, deep-souled, intuitive, sincere, who in his prime was foredoomed to the cruelest death. Each of these attributes, even when alone, has been wont to arouse apotheosizing tendencies. The modern world tends to forget the power of pathos of which Jesus' death was the world's supreme masterpiece, which no tragedy, antique or modern, has ever approached. The ancient Hebrews had pitied themselves uniquely and cumulatively, and now in the survivors of Jesus' circle all these tendencies were brought to a sharp focus in one man and his supreme act that typified all the age-long sufferings of the race, of which he thought himself the totemic representative or type-man. Thus Jewish persistence of hope concentrated itself upon a unipersonal object. Also, and what was far more to the point, his fate was symbolic of that of his people. If his life had really gone out in despair, it prefigured the extinction of hope for his race. It, too, would end as he had ended. Acceptance of the main features of Jesus' eschatology was thus both pre- and over-determined by the conscious and unconscious analogies involved in it. To accept his despair as final and prophetic would be ominous that God had forsaken his race, while conversely his Resurrection and rehabilitation would only express the persistent hope of the Jews that they would be reëstablished in the world along the lines of their faith in the promises. If Jesus survived the extreme calamity, and came back to judge and rule, so the chosen people could not be overwhelmed, but would come to rule the earth. Thus the choicest treasure of the Hebrew soul, transferred and transvaluated, went over into the new Christian consciousness that arose from Jesus' tomb. All this had really occurred before the vision that came to Paul on his way to Damascus, so that in preaching Jesus he was in a sense only continuing to advance the cause that he had striven to promote as a persecutor, only now it is Judaism sublimated and freed from its literalism and exclusiveness. Thus primitive Christianity was Judaism resurrected and transformed, re-asserting its old faith in the Covenant, but extending its benefits to the elect among the gentiles, as indeed had to be done because so few within the old pale had penetration enough to see the old in its transfigured new form. Thus the heart and soul of the old Hebrew dispensation

went over into the new, leaving the remainder to lapse to still lower stages of formalism, literalism, and religious materialism, until it became little more than a cast or husk from which life had departed.

Thus Jesus did come back, and speedily, before the Gospels were written, not as he expected but more effectively. The lurid imagery of his eschatology faded. Wherever it has had recrudescence in fanatic texts later, it has been rank and lush for a season, but has soon proven to be only a deciduous foliage. It left as its far more precious and perennial result a futuristic attitude of soul inspired by hope for both the individual and the race. It loosened and enriched the soil for all conceptions of progress, created ideals of evolution, filled men with the buoyant sense that the best things have not happened yet, gave ambition, made the old narrow prophetism a diffusive power, and gave a courage and hope that enabled the human race to endure the tragedy of the fall of the old states, cultures, and civilizations. Much of this general new courageousness, perhaps too much of it, went over into the specific form of a belief in personal immortality. If this belief often tended to be a fetishistic form of the great new wave of futurism, so that the impulses to reform this world were weakened, it nevertheless conserved a precious thing through ages so troubled that had it been only socially conceived it would have been utterly lost. The Church was the external form which the new futurism took on in its immanent mundane sphere, always correlated with the thought-forms of a transcendental heavenly future. The hope and the treasure of falling States went over to it. But for it the world might have despaired. The Kingdom it conceived could only have its symbol or preparatory school on this earth; but this helped men to look away from and beyond the present at times and places, or in circumstances when they needed to do so, if they were not to lose hope. On the eschatological theory everything Jesus and his followers taught focussed on some mood and tense of the single word—hope. Everything the Christian says is a variation on this theme, and all he does is to sustain and increase it. If this view has at last really found the true Jesus unknown even to the Evangelists his message to us is that, instead of being too absorbed in the past or even in the here and now, our chief endeavour must be to construe the future. It follows, of course, since this is so uncertain as to admit of countless constructions, that we shall make mistakes as Jesus did in his plan, and so change to a second; nor is this any ground

of disparagement, because the future must ever be recast. It is rather to his glory that he could change and readjust to new insights, for all interested in the future must ever do this. It is less to his credit, however, that he died in despair because he realized that his second plan had miscarried. A third, fourth, or series of other programs would surely have included among them that of waiting, but this his impetuous soul could not do. Perhaps if he had not followed the issue to a fatal termination, but had lived on to a good old age, he would have come to accept some other and more deliberate program for the advent of the Kingdom, and have realized that the essential thing was that it would and must come at some dateless and perhaps very remote time, whether suddenly or gradually, and that constant expectant tension with variable direction of orientation to it was the main thing. The eschatological view certainly also makes Jesus seem far more historic, because the issues involved are so vital and the psychic processes which concern us here are so true to the nature of the soul, although nearly all the phenomena are those of unusual altitude. Although the whole is entirely without precedent, the items of which it is composed have, some of them, innumerable analogies and parallels in human history and experience. Here they are all summated and synthetized, and to re-realize the whole Gospel story from this new standpoint exalts the soul, augments its energies, gives new immunity against being ensnared in narrow and partial views, tends to purge many imperfections, makes the central figure of the New Testament nearer, more attractive, imposing, and, in a word, more sublime and Godlike in its solitary effort to find and open a new and true way of salvation for man.

Thus in Jesus the futurism of all the prophets culminated. The protensive diathesis of youth, of ascendent races; the mood of dawn and springtide, of abounding vitality and health or wholeness, aggressive energy, self-affirmation; the excelsior spirit of ambition; the zeal that would reform society and convert the world; the feeling that man as he is is but the embryo of what he is to become as superman; the impulse that would intensify the present because it is parturient of a far greater and better age, that believes in a golden age but conceives it as future rather than as past; the religion of eugenics, which holds that the present generation should live solely in the interests of the countless generations to be born from it, and to which the duty of all

duties is to transmit the torch of life undimmed and burning ever brighter; the mania for progress and the phobia of stagnation or conservatism; the supreme will to serve and live for a long line of posterity rather than to revere ancestors; the feeling that great destinies depend upon present decisions—all these are distinctively Christian in their psychogenesis. Their organ is faith; their *Einstellung* or attitude is something which Jesus, if he did not bring it into the world, supremely illustrates. It calls to the world to think more in the future tense, and it is this that reanimates and starts on the upward track all races and individuals that have adopted the Christian viewpoint. If Jesus lost the true temporal perspective of the Kingdom and thought the righteous would inherit the new earth at once, that only intensified this *Stellungsnahme* toward the hereafter. It is precisely this that gives us the new key by which psychology is now able to unlock the very secret soul of Jesus himself, which has never been understood before, and which but one Christologist, O. Holtzmann, has ever glimpsed, although Schweitzer, who one would think would be the first to see, refuses to admit it. Living as Jesus did in this highly wrought state of expectancy, his powers were subjected to the greatest stimulus and strain which could be put upon them, and therefore, though not an ecstatic in the sense Holtzmann urges, he was more or less erethic, more habitually in a state of exaltation or second breath, illustrating what we now term "the higher powers of man." This tiptoe or superlative state is not ecstasy in the clinical sense, but is inebriation with great ideas in Plato's sense. In this temperament inhibition and restraint have less power to fetter the soul, and so it is more unreserved to let itself go with abandon in response to the incitations of each occasion. In such a disposition anger can blaze forth without stint, and love and devotion are no less unrepressed. Fasting, hardship, heroism in the face of danger, living completely for one's ideal, moods of depression and of elevation, may all go to the limit. Now the soul is the victim of hope, now of despair, and each in turn fills the whole field of consciousness and evicts its opposite. Only such lives can exhaust the possibilities of individual, and in a sense of racial, experience. Every passing movement of such souls is prone to be superlative. The ordinary repressions that cramp and warp most are cast to the winds. If in such a disposition the psychic structure is sound and the life pure, with no dangerous secrets liable to be betrayed because there

is nothing to conceal, there is no thought of consistency, the fetish of souls that feel themselves lacking in organic unity and in danger of fission or dissolution into multiple personalities, for there is no peril in escaping the conventions, whether of belief or conduct. If we are right in claiming for Jesus this kind of character we can understand why he seemed so many different sorts of persons at different times, and also why those who try to delineate him now differ so widely. The harmony of his powers was too deep to be disturbed by his reactions to different solicitations. Such characters seem very polymorphic to others, but they exist and constitute a true ethological species. They are not multipersonal in a pathological sense, and the point of our contention is that while they do bear a very close resemblance to fictive personalities that are the product of syncretism, they are not so, but are in a sense more real than any other type. In fact, only in free energetic souls keyed to a constant high pitch, as Jesus was by his eschatological concepts of the world and his view of his own functions, can we have the generic type of individual. In such the race finds fullest expression in the life of the individual. This type of person can best represent in his own life that of the race, which should find ample expression in each. Thus the eschatological concepts and an erethic disposition would seem almost inseparable, each as cause and effect of the other. To the amplification and the proof of this position we shall return later.

Consciousness also gave an unprecedented reinforcement to the moral sense. In the impending world-assize not only outer but inner iniquity meets an awful doom, and goodness will have its glorious reward. Friends will be separated and consigned to the most opposite fates. The age of concealment and procrastination is finished. Conversion, not merely of the intellect in the sense of Plato's myth of the cave, but of heart, will, and the conduct of life, is imperative. There is no escape from the purgation of fire save by repentance. All not found fit to enter the heavenly Kingdom will go to the counter-kingdom of Satan. Man is at the cross-roads and must choose, for there is no middle course. If a great pestilence were to come and men had to reconstruct their diet and regimen, the principles of personal and public hygiene would be reinforced by all the instincts of self-preservation. Thus Jesus' eschatology reinforced moral hygiene, and thus his futurism made the world more keenly conscious of sin than ever before.

This construed the world as through and through moral, with ethical laws supreme, established a new and stronger association between evil-doing and fear, which had thus a new deterrent if not preventive power. The age-long sin scare which eschatology threw into the souls of men was a drastic moral pedagogy, and has left some scars, as seen in the ethically disequilibrated, but on the whole it was the most beneficent and efficient autotherapy Mansoul has ever brought upon itself, and saved the race from being submerged in the flood of putrid corruption which followed the collapse of the old civilizations under the successive waves of barbaric invasion. Hell,[1] the psychology of which we are just beginning to understand aright, became very real and near, culminating in Dante, and death became a veritable muse and a symbol of the yet more dreadful second death. Thanatophobia[2] and gennaphobia were harnessed up with harmatophobia. It is the puny fashion of our age to distrust fear cures, and, indeed, they are always dangerous to weaklings, but we forget that fear is the beginning of wisdom, and that those who have feared wisely and well have inherited the earth; for fear is only the anticipation of pain. We forget that fear of disease created medicine and hygiene; that fear of death has been the chief factor in the evolution of the doctrine of immortality as compensation for mortality; that social and political institutions evolve from fear of anarchy; that the Church, insurance, and even science, that is making man the master instead of the slave of nature, are in no small degree products of fear; and that one of the chief spurs of ambition to make the most and best of our individual lives springs from the fear of inferiority or mediocrity. To this emotion eschatology made the strongest of all possible appeals, and Christian virtue owes it a debt it can never estimate.

Was the real historic Jesus, as the psychologist may now conceive him in the new light of modern liberal studies, a truly great man? And if so how great was he, and wherein consisted his superiority? Paidologists are now learning how hard it is to grade intelligence even in children and to establish norms and standards by which to distinguish the normal from the subnormal. Halls of fame, learned academies, "Who's Who," industrial corporations, efficiency experts, anthropologists, psychologists, characterologists, eugenists, and the psychol-

[1] C. F. Sparkman: "Satan and His Ancestors." *Jour. Relig. Psychol.*, 1912, vol. 5, pp. 52-85, and 163-194. F. T. Hall: "The Pedigree of the Devil." Also Tompson, 1883, p. 256.

[2] G. Stanley Hall: "Thanatophobia and Immortality." *Am. Jour. Psychol.*, 1915, vol. 26, pp. 550-613.

ogists of genius and talent and the analyzers of the biographies of great men, are all seeking to assort and grade the human qualities that make up the few personalities that tower highest above the rank and file of mankind. We have already from several sources attempts to forecast the overman of the future, from Aristotle's magnanimous man, the true aristocrat, and the Stoic sage, down to Zarathustra.

What is the place of Jesus amidst all these modern criteria and evaluations of men? The old diploma of greatness was divinitization, and of no one has this been more persistently urged. This old pedestal or supreme encomium, despite the unanimity of the consensus of the past, no longer suffices, at least for many. Hegel said in substance that the great were those who forced mankind to discuss and explain them until different groups of interpreters arose and contended with one another. This process began for Jesus with the authors of the epistles and Gospels, or before, and for two millennia he has been more studied, written, and thought of than any other person in history. But fame alone is not a test of true inner greatness. Carlyle said great men are those who change the current of history. Jesus certainly marked the dawn of our new era. Emerson stressed the opening of new culture fields and trends, and measured on this scale Jesus certainly towers above all others. But the question still remains how much of the movement that bears his name was his own personal work, and whether but for his successors any such institution as the Church would have arisen, for we are still unable to enucleate with confidence just what Jesus was, did, and said. Since Galton,[1] heredity has been stressed, and we have voluminous if inconclusive discussions of the relative value of inheritance and environment. Reibmayer[2] thinks that talent and genius are more commonly products of settled but simple life with agriculture and trade, but that talent is more prone to spring from inbreeding where parents differ little, while genius is more often a product of cross-breeding between parents of different families, stations, or even races. How alert the earliest followers of Jesus were to the necessity of giving him the best of pedigrees by making him at once the son of David and of God, and by beatifying his mother, we saw in Chapter 4. Whatever our interpretation of the earliest records, there is not only no indication of any handicap but much that was

[1] Galton: "Hereditary Genius." 1892, 379 p.

[2] "Entwicklungsgeschichte des Talents und Genies." 2 Bände, 1908. See especially Bd. 1, S. 513 *et seq.*

favourable for subsequent greatness in both his ancestry and his early environment. The same may be said of the latter if we agree with Freudians, who deem greatness largely due to infantile experiences. Joly,[1] Türck,[2] and especially Fischer,[3] as well as H. Ellis[4] and many others, have attempted to define both the conditions and the very many and complex characteristics of greatness, which Lombroso,[5] Nordau[6] and their numerous followers always think tainted with insanity, while Hirsch[7] seeks to trace the genesis of fame.

(A) Amidst all the wide diversity of opinion in literature one point of unanimity that stands out, perhaps before all others, and one very significant for the characterization of Jesus, is that greatness involves the union of the most opposite qualities. The great man must be at once very receptive and very active. He must be passive and docile and accept facts as they are, even if it has to be with stoicism and resignation. He must yield to present reality with utter acquiescence until he grasps it completely, not fly from or ignore it because it is disagreeable to face if it goes counter to all his wishes and prejudices. He must understand the misunderstandings of his enemies, and anticipate the worst that they can say or do. He must appreciate obstacles and difficulties at their full value. He must be able to see and even take the other side temporarily and with *Einfühlung*. He must take pleasure in the range of his sympathies and, if need be, "accept the inevitable with joy" in the sense of Seneca. But on the other hand, this consummation of the noetic must not check but rather excite a counter-conative reaction if he is sure he is right. Knowing what he is up against, he must not lie down or quit, but cling to his purpose tenaciously with the utmost courage and perseverance. He must glory in conflict, love danger, enjoy the maximum of effort and suffering, and if things are not according to his will must make them so. He must enlist for this purpose every resource he can summon, within or without, be ready constantly to modify, if necessary, not only methods but his initial impulsion, and must continue to do so indefinitely until his goal is attained. The energy of his aggressiveness must bend other wills,

[1] "Psychologie des grandes hommes." Paris, 1883, 280 p.
[2] "The Man of Genius." Schwerin, 1914, 483 p.
[3] "Der Grossgeist des höchste menschliche Ideal." 1908, 280 p.
[4] "A Study of British Genius," 1904, 300 p.
[5] "L'homme de génie." Paris, 1889, 499 p.
[6] "Degeneration." 7th ed. London, 1893, 560 p.
[7] "Die Genesis des Ruhmes." 1914, 285 p.

beat down or evade all opposition; and he must often seem relentless if not pitiless in this work. Most of the world's *élite* are great either in insight or in action, but very few indeed combine the two in due proportion. Türck and the Freudians best describe this amphibole, and religionists, e. g., Cromwell and his followers so far as they were abjectly passive toward God and imperative and domineering toward the world, best illustrate it. In this respect of course Jesus is supreme. He, however, found it hard to accept the god of things as they are, although he went to the limit of voluntarily meeting death. So intent was he upon his own supreme affirmation of will in establishing the Kingdom, that he perhaps fell short of appreciating the strength of the opposition, unless, of course, he really meant to die as he did, and trust all to the reaction thus provoked. In that case he measures up to the criterion more than any other. Knowing Satan and all the mundane powers arrayed against him for all they were and could do, he nevertheless challenged and overcame them. Jesus was not one whose intellect paralyzed his will, like Hamlet, or perverted it, like Faust. Nor was he a great executive of ill-laid plans, or a hero of a mistaken cause or of a good one foolishly served. He was an expert in both the depth and truth of his religious insights. The work he organized, considering the human material he had to deal with and the short time he believed was left before the consummation of the existing order of things, could hardly have been improved upon. If, however, he planned by his death to spur others to carry on his work as they did, his mastery of means to this end was above our full comprehension even yet, for not only was his will power Stoic and even Promethean, but his sagacity and foresight remain in a class by themselves. H. Bushnell[1] thought him "a great social and religious architect with a plan embracing ages," and that his work of establishing the Kingdom, humanly impossible, was the chief proof that he was more than a man. Of the two primitive documents which so many critics now believe to have been the precursors of our Gospels, the Ur-Markus and the logia, the former was mainly concerned with what Jesus did and the latter with what he taught, thought, or said, as if the first two groups of his followers and the first two lines of tradition, one stressing his practice and the other his theory of life, were for a time rival parties, perhaps, which our Gospels strove to synthetize. So, in the history of theology, we

[1] "The Character of Jesus." New York, 1895.

find interest now in Christ's work and now in his words paramount. Are we not thus justified in inferring a high and a uniquely well-balanced development of both will and intellect in Jesus?

(B) Another trait always prominent in the characterization of great men, and illustrated in the hundreds of biographies that have lately been so carefully rummaged in quest of the secret of eminence, is that they have exceptional experience with both the extremes of pleasure and pain. They both suffer and enjoy keenly, and fate often leads them to the superlative degree of both. The power to respond to one does not destroy, but heightens, the power of response to the other. Such men can be afflicted and even long depressed without settling into melancholia, and can exult with euphoria and enjoy all the real pleasures of life without abnormal exaltation. Pleasure and pain are the two poles of experience, the sovereign motives and masters of life, which is made up of efforts to enlarge the field of the former and to reduce that of the latter. Too much as well as too little of either dwarfs, arrests, or perverts, just as children need both to laugh and to cry. This power of response to either, together with rebound and resilience between the optimistic and the pessimistic experiences and interpretations of life, exploring each to its limit without becoming its captive, gives the soul range, richness, variety; and not only greatness but sanity depends upon this elasticity, for most forms of alienation begin in psychalgia or hypereuphoria. Every novel or drama is an exercise in alternations between the tension of imminent danger and the relaxation of the happy ending, and this is a very potent preventive and psychotherapy in securing to the mind unity and safeguarding it against danger of fission. All life is cadenced between work and play, striving and recreation, failure and success, defeats and victories, and the great soul hungers for both, loves risks and hardships as well as enjoyments. Small men gravitate predominantly toward the one or the other, and make but short, infrequent, and timid excursions over into the domain of the other.

How does Jesus as we now understand him measure up on this standard? Renan, Haase, and Keim long ago pointed out his aversion to asceticism, his love of the joys of life, and even Strauss spoke of his gentle *Heiterkeit.* In 1876 A. Wünsche published his "Der lebensfreudige Jesu," representing him as exultant, triumphant, and prone to indulge in all innocent joys of life, and thrilled with success. He sought

to "deliver the figure of Jesus from the unhistorical shadows in which it has lain, and set it in the sunshine where it belongs." Six years earlier, however, in 1870, Wünsche had published his "Die Leiden des Messias" which represents Jesus as the man of sorrows and the suffering servant of Yahveh, as dark a picture as the former was a bright one, leaving us a little uncertain how much of the difference between these two books was due to a deep change of conviction on the author's part or to a mere change of attitude and theme. Zangwill describes Jesus not as a "tortured God" but as a "joyous comrade." Dawson says of Christ, "He became the incarnation of the spirit of joy, the symbol of the bliss of life," and "Christ's gracious gaiety of heart proved contagious," etc.[1] Recent works still more popular show the same tendency to react from the Puritan rancour against happiness. R. Law[2] has a chapter each upon his joy and his geniality. A. Whyte,[3] in describing the thirty-three *dramatis personae* in the New Testament, gives a somewhat humorous turn to the accounts of the enemy who sowed tares by night, the man who sowed a grain of mustard seed, the one who found a great treasure in the field, the wedding guest in unfitting costume, and the children dancing in the market place. G. W. Buckley[4] goes still further in his attempt to "resurrect Jesus from theology and humanize him." He urges that Jesus had a keen sense of the comedy of life; that he admired the brilliant repartee of the Canaanite woman to his saying that it was not meet to give the children's bread to the dogs, to which she retorted that the dogs might eat the crumbs. It was really not her faith but her wit and humour which made him yield. The new piece in the old garment describes a comic thing. So does the story of the man waking his neighbour because he has a hungry guest; of the judge who yielded because he feared the woman's continual coming; the saying that no one can serve two masters; the asking bread and giving a stone; the woman who rejoiced over the finding of a penny. These to Buckley are "realistic, palpable hits." He sees humour, too, in the story of the foolish virgins. This sense of humour made the common people hear him gladly. The stupidity and *faux pas* of the disciples, who understood him as little as Goethe's Wagner understood Faust; the address to the soul, "Thou hast much goods laid up,"

[1] See Peabody's "Jesus and the Christian Character." 1905, 48 p.
[2] "The Emotions of Jesus." 1915, 154 p.
[3] "Bible Characters; Our Lord's Character." Chicago, 311 p.
[4] "The Wit and Wisdom of Jesus." Boston, 1901, 213 p.

which suggests Holbein's "Dance of Death"; the admonition not to sit in the chief seat at a feast, or ask to dinner only those who will ask you to dine in turn; these and the many pithy epigrammatic sayings that the world knows by heart show that Jesus was a great conversationalist, as witty as he was wise; that he was as ready with pleasantry, satire, ridicule, and irony as he was with invectives. Perhaps no one goes quite so far as Bousset[1] in making the joy of life the chief trait of Jesus.

Most now think the first part of Jesus' career more joyous and the last part more sad. If we are told that he wept, but not that he laughed, as if, like Chesterfield, he was one of Sully's[2] misogelasts or laughter-haters or phobiacs (and no artist ever yet dared to make him smile), he must nevertheless have had sources and times of ecstatic joy in communion with God, made Eureka discoveries of new insights, felt the satisfaction of attaining ineluctable certainties where others wandered in doubt.

But whatever was the case with Jesus' own experiences, his immediate followers, between the time he died the most disgraceful of deaths and his body was sealed in the tomb or lost and their full conviction that he had risen and ascended, passed from the nadir of despair to the zenith of exaltation at Pentecost. Their spirits, at least metaphorically, passed through hell and up to heaven. The story of the cross and its sequel is the world's masterpiece of pathos and of triumph; and this great algedonic ebb and flow constitute the world's chief autotherapy, its immunity-bath against being finally overwhelmed by pain and disaster on the one hand, or on the other, by intoxication with inebriating joy because the king of terrors has been overcome. Thus they could look death in the face and defy him to do his worst, as countless martyrs did in the nine persecutions that followed. (See the chapter on the Death and Resurrection.) In fact, the very core of Christianity consists in a discipline in meeting pleasure and pain, without going through which adolescence, the golden period of life, is incomplete and suffers arrest, so that the novitiate to life is unprepared to meet it, and his poise and equilibrium between the two chief dangers and opportunities remain unsafeguarded. (See my "Adolescence," Vol. 2, chapter 14, "Adolescent Psychology of Conversion.")

(C) All characterizations of greatness specify alternations between

[1] "Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum." 1892, 130 p.
[2] See his "Essay on Laughter." 1902, 441 p.

solitude and society, or between subjective and objective life. The Catholic Church has always found a soul-cure in the "retreat." Modern moralists, especially the French ethical writers for young people, emphasize a silent hour for meditation or introspection.[1] The psychology of solitude shows its high ethical value for those who are great enough to avoid its dangers.[2] As MacNish shows, solitude reinforces heredity; society and the objective life make for individual adaptation to the environment. The desert, says Renan in substance, perhaps even more than the mountain, has always been the stronghold of great Semitic spirits and the cradle of great ideas. Aloneness teaches self-knowledge, self-control, and reverence for inner oracles. With social restraints and distractions removed, we are free to be and to face ourselves. We get close to nature and to God. Hermits, eremites, cloistered monks, entertain and reinforce their own personalities and incubate the supreme problems of life and death, good, evil, destiny, and providence. Türck and Fischer point out how often the very greatest men even outside the Church remain celibate, because their affections are fixed on larger interests than those of the family, although perhaps maintaining ideal relations to the other sex, as Wünsche thinks Jesus did,[3] pointing out the immense service women rendered to the Church in apostolic and patristic times. Solitude, too, gives true perspective, and inclines religious minds to prayer. Jesus knew and used this resource to an unusual extent during all his career, from the flight into the wilderness in order to muse on the staggering suggestions that came to him at the baptism, to Gethsemane. He often took refuge from the multitude, escaped to northern Galilee when the disciples were absent on their first missionary journey, and his habit was not to fly from but to prepare for difficult emergencies. Some writers make much of the secret life of Jesus, and Ollivier[4] believes that in his infancy and youth he was much alone, partly on account of the Herodian slaughter of so many near his own age. Although he was so above those in his *entourage* that he must have felt isolated in their presence, he nevertheless loved their companionship, had his favourites and intimates, and has even been described as a "brilliant dialectician." As one who loved to sharpen wits by dialogue and discussion in the

[1] See my "Educational Problems," Vol. 1, chap. 5, on "Moral Education," *passim*.
[2] Small: "On Some Psychical Relations of Society and Solitude." *Ped. Sem.*, Apr., 1900. vol, 7, pp. 13-69.
[3] "Jesu in seiner Stellung an die Frauen." 1872, 146 p.
[4] "La vie cachée de Jesu." Paris, 1904, 465 p.

sense in which Plato commends this method of investigation, and took pleasure in discourse with strangers, both men and women, although he preferred as a teacher to communicate his own and God's truth, he still took a true and pedagogic pleasure in answering questions and meeting objections. His preparation was not that of a reader, as Plato reproached Aristotle with being, but, as Plato claimed for himself, he sought inner insights and was a true autodidact. Perhaps he did feel the inspiration of attentive crowds, even though he never gave the set sermon on the mount. He certainly was a master opportunist in seizing on every occasion, as it arose, to impart his precepts, and was in vital *rapport* with both the individuals and the groups he met, and his Kingdom required every member of it to be an ideal *socius*, as Christian socialism in both its narrower and larger sense is now abundantly telling us. Both the *agapæ* and the institution of the supper cement the closest of all bonds between men, as the Fourth Gospel shows us, closer than love between the sexes. Nothing is more contagious than religious emotion.

(D) Great men often believe themselves inwardly influenced by some power above themselves. This power has been very diversely interpreted and has been assigned the most diverse functions. Muses, guardian angels, individual guiding spirits, good and bad, fates, destiny, fortune, luck, *gorus*, familiar spirits, etc., are all different names for it, and it is thought sometimes to enter and control individuals until they seem possessed as by alien personalities. Many feel themselves caught up or borne along by a momentum not at their own command. If these phenomena are predominantly intellectual they are often conceived as inspiration or revelation; if mainly emotional, as ecstasy. If the synergy of the afflatus is chiefly conative it may be thought a categorical reinforcement of duty or a specifically decreed commission, command, or calling from on high which, like Luther, they cannot resist. It may only gently dissuade, like Socrates' daimon, or issue peremptory positive commands in an hallucinated voice. Its language may be vision or the word of the Lord as it came to the prophets. Sometimes it causes rapt trancoidal states, or it may hyperenergize the active, efferent tracts. From shamanism and witchcraft to the *Convulsionnaires* of St. Medard; from the mantic mænads to Shakers, Jumpers, and speakers with tongues, we now know that it is only some higher potentialization of the powers of the individual. Plato de-

scribed two kinds of delirium, one the *furor poeticus* that inspired great creative works, especially in the domain of religion, art, and literature, while the other was insanity. Between the latter and genius, especially since Lélut, Moreau, and Lombroso, a considerable and growing literature[1] has pointed out a relation. Whether we interpret these phenomena in the old ways as visitations from without or on high, or, as we now know them to be, as incursions into consciousness from the subliminal realm, they are as real as second breath, and some degree of these states is by no means uncommon, especially in vital and naïve souls. In its lesser degrees the subject feels free but with augmented power, while in the higher degrees of it he feels himself a passive agent and knows no more than do onlookers what he is going to say, see, hear, or do next. His autistically active self becomes objective. At their best these erethic states are simply the superfluity of vitality, and supervene when the evolutionary *nisus* of the growth impulse is at its highest tide; for evolution is the only true revelation. They represent life at high pressure with all its resources rung up, mobilized, and in action. Instead of doing our work ourselves and with effort, we stand off, look on, and see it done for us by some unusual, latent power. Perhaps we accomplish prodigies, surprise ourselves, feel that we are being used and swept along. What we deemed hard is easy, and what was obscure clears up, for we feel clairvoyant, clairaudient, obsessed by our task, and borne along whether we will or not. We feel informed by a higher wisdom than our own, and when we come back to ourselves we review these experiences as if they pertained to another, and they seem new to us. Of course experiences that follow these formulae occur also in neurotics and psychotics, and the alien power may be complex and develop into what seems another personality. Fanaticism, too, might be characterized in some of the same terms, so that all spirits have to be proved and tested. Again, the ardour of the impulsion may be so great or long continued that the psychophysic system of its victim may suffer lesions or impairments; but to be able to summon such reserves in emergencies is wondrous gain, and it is no whit more difficult to distinguish between right and wrong uses or results of these experiences than between any problems of morals or of

[1] To cite a few, e. g., see P. Radestock: "Genie und Wahnsinn," 1884. E. Murisier: "Les maladies du sentiment religieux," 1901. J. F. Nisbet: "The Insanity of Genius," 6th ed., 1912. J. Morse: "Pathological Aspects of Religion," 1906. W. James: "Varieties of Religious Experience," especially p. 77 *et seq.* See also, for two specific aberrations ideally analyzed, Pfister on "Glossalalie und Kryptographie," in *Jahrb. f. Psychoanalyse*, 1912. Vol. 3, p. 427 and 730 *et seq.*

hygiene. There is no practical, but only theoretic, difficulty of definition. The acts of genius itself can never be insane, although their *sequelae* or concomitants as found in pathological natures may often be so.

From this viewpoint Jesus seems the Supreme Master of all who have ever known or utilized consummately the higher powers of man. Most that he did and said that is significant was with some degree of such afflatus. God and the Holy Spirit were his muse. He followed inner oracles that he thought came from on high as no one else had ever done, and it is small matter that after the fashion of his day and as the masses always have done and will do, he objectified these impulsions. Indeed, epistemologically speaking, no one can know what he does not objectify. He projected the power he lived by into heaven, identified it with the Hebrew Yahveh, and whatever may be said in this case of the processes of the intellect, which is an individual and relatively accidental product, the heart of every one who is truly religious can as yet make or poetize no better imagery than this, for feeling must always have symbols all its own. The psychology of Jesus remains to-day by far the best and most classic field in which to study all such processes, for here best of all these problems are illustrated. Here we find a key to the understanding of his character, further study of which will no doubt long continue, as it has already so well begun to do, to make his life seem more real, his traits more intelligible, and his biographies more engaging.

(E) Comparative studies of biographies, and especially of autobiographies of great men, show as another attribute, closely allied to the above, a sense that they are not merely themselves but generic or type-men, or that in them the species is especially expressed in the individual. They feel themselves in a sense the embodiment of the soul of their tribe, race, nation, or other group; the bearer of its ideals, its leader or representative; the voice through which the wishes, will, needs of the larger social group are expressed. Some think the roots of this trait must be traced to totemism. Its perversions tend to hypertrophied egoism, but its ideal is to subordinate, if not evacuate, the individual, so that he who best illustrates it has a passion to renounce rather than to acquire, to serve rather than to rule, the group he represents. His own personal proprium shrivels rather than expands; he becomes least, not greatest; his personal fortunes, or even his life or

death, are inconsequential compared with the weal or woe of the group interests of which he is the surrogate. If he comes to supreme power he uses it humbly as a charge or cause to which he is entirely subject. He is a delegate or a corporate folk-soul, and to live to himself would be treason to it. If he is utterly devoted to the common welfare, he may legitimately feel himself a man of destiny because he is bound up with it to the point of identification, so that its well- or ill-being is his own. This gives enlargement of view, purity of purpose, a sense of responsibility that may become oppressive, perhaps temptations at times either to use it for self-aggrandizement or on the other hand to renounce it all and fall back to the easier, simpler life, and live for individual ends, perhaps according to Nietzsche's ideal of the superman, who is a powerful and relentless monster of selfishness, incapable of pity or regret. The altruistic struggle for the survival of others in the supremely great is the diametrical opposite of this. It is born of a spirit of sympathy, benevolence, coöperation, and love of mankind. It is phylogeny exceptionally dominant over ontogeny, the race controlling the individual. It is rooted in man's highly gregarious instinct, and thus makes for social solidarity and against disruption.

Now, whoever illustrated all this as Jesus did? He did it by drawing on the unconscious reserve energies as described above (in 4), because men differ most in their most conscious activities and are most alike in the nine tenths of their nature which is usually submerged, so that in calling it up man appeals to the common element in which all, even the most diverse, are, at bottom, one. Here we reach nearest of all to the secret springs of Jesus' character and the simple motivation of his life and works; from this point of view we can best understand the mystery of his Kingdom and the "way" into it. It is *das ewige Menschliche das zieht uns hinan*, an ideal yet far from attainment but that lures, charms, and inspires perennial visions of its ultimate fulfilment, gives us the norms of all social ethics, a standard by which to measure all real progress, which at bottom and at its best is always and only moral, and that would minimize hate and all its dreadful progeny, and establish harmony and confraternity over the world. It is still largely a sentiment; but sentiment dominates the human heart, and has already given the Christian world most of the best things in it and promises far more in the future. No message to man is so authentic as that which comes from his own phylum, and the only validification of its

authority is that it rings true in each individual soul it reaches. This is the supreme criterion of every truth and value in the humanistic realm as distinct from that of physical science. To incarnate the best that is in the race is to incarnate God, for he only is its highest anthropomorph.

(F) Other attributes of greatness, less often specified, are combinations of pairs of opposites that are rarely found in the same person, such as analytic and synthetic, or critical and creative powers; traits which lie chiefly in the sphere of intellect or balance between the conservative and progressive temper; the union of Olympian calmness and enthusiasm; of quick and slow temperaments; vivid imagination along with practical common sense; open-mindedness and absence of prejudice; readiness, if need be, to subordinate personal friendship and all social, even family, ties to a cause greater than they; indifference to fame or all personal ends; keen aesthetic sense; an alert and inerrant conscience; power of concentration; great strength of affection; the group of qualities we call personal magnetism; a disposition to be always working over and improving oneself; ability to systematize and make or apply efficient methods; a gift for keeping always in the top of one's condition, physically, mentally, morally; the instinct to strive and exert oneself to the utmost of his powers rather than to live in the realm of inertia and half efforts—these and other qualities are designated in this literature on great men and have great though perhaps not prime significance. In Jesus the strength of his affections was certainly unbounded, although they were less concentrated upon individuals than diffused over the race, or at least those fit for the Kingdom. He was well anchored in Jewish conservatism, and yet ultra-progressive. He did not seek fame, and must have had rare magnetism and charm (see Chapter 1). He gave himself to his task with an energy that was unreserved and unflagging. On the other hand, he was probably not emancipated from racial prejudice and was inefficient in methods of social and political improvement as measured by the modern standard. He cared little or nothing for system, either in his thinking or in the conduct of his life, and knew no science of any kind. The rest of these standards either test qualities not known in his day, and so are more specific and less generically human, or else we are too uninformed concerning Jesus' life and character to apply them to him.

To the present writer it seems hardly less than axiomatic that if Jesus' personality is to continue to have worth and reality in the world and not fade into myth, symbol, or a projection of the community consciousness in the sense of Kalthoff, or if his character is not to become as formless and unknown as his physical traits are to art, he must be definitized and we must have at least certain fundamental ideas of what psychological components entered into the *ensemble* of qualities which we call character and personality. We need to escape from the mystic nebulosity that now surrounds it. A union of all the superlative traits ascribed to him, a harmonious synthesis of the partial components that appear from different aspects of his life, work, and words, which shall combine all the different views of him, is impossible, for they could not be synthetized in any individual, normal, abnormal, or supernormal. In place of a living person we should have in him rather a table of ethological categories theoretically and logically unhomogeneous and the correlation of which into a single human being is a psychological impossibility. This would give us at best only a classified list of traits with certain tentative groupings but lacking dynamic force because without any real organic unity. If we cull these traits from the scores of lives of Jesus during the last few score years, every possible synthesis of them thus far suggested gives at best only the conception of a personality unprecedentedly multiple or schizophrenic, as if tenanted by a congeries of souls of which now one, now another, comes to the fore. Now he seems divine, now very human. In the wilderness he struggles with temptation, yet is impeccable. Here he is above earthly joy and sorrow, yet in the transfiguration he seems to be in a transport of euphoria, while in Gethsemane he is in agony. Now his belief is ineluctable, and he is autodidactic, and again he feels forsaken, if not accursed, of God. He is called infallible and inerrant, and yet repeatedly changes his purpose upon intercession; endowed with prescient prophetic insight into the future, yet dies in anguish and despair because his hopes aborted and his plans miscarried. From this viewpoint one could almost fancy that we have before us a product of a series of efforts to synthetize into one the typical traits and experiences of many different real or mythic personages of which primitive culture gives us many examples, and that here the hazy name, "Jesus," is simply their *point de repère*. He needs to be made a more natural, real, and dynamic personality.

Can this be done? Is there a type of personality that is more composite and yet more unified than those we know, in which all the essential attributes that history assigns and religious psychology needs can be combined? Is there any one such *ensemble* of qualities more probable than any other, and which, in the light of the New Testament data and also of the preceding principles, we can best conceive Jesus to have been? To this our answer must be affirmative and is as follows:

(1) Jesus had an invincible sense of his own vast superiority over other men, and felt that he stood closer to the source of all wisdom and power than any other man had ever stood. He interpreted this sense according to the highest and fittest thought-forms of his day and race, as the Church has since done, as Divine Sonship or Messianity. He came to do this gradually, but as an inevitable result of many experiences with many men, which showed him, as they must, that his insights were deeper, his personal influence over those about him greater, his therapeutic efficiency which he thought showed unique control of demons, was equal to or superior to that of the greatest of prophets of old. The complicated sophistries of the subtlest of the Pharisees were no match for him, and although, unlike the rabbis, self-taught, he found he could easily confute them. Those who crowded about him and followed him to be healed and taught regarded him as a man of a higher order. In rapt states to which great souls, especially among Orientals, are sometimes subject, his visions, as in the baptism and the temptation, favoured those fond ideas of greatness which are secretly cherished by every ardent aspiring young genius. Thus it was as inevitable as that Socrates should find from converse with many men who thought themselves wise that he was wiser than they all in that he knew that he knew nothing, that Jesus should, with his unusual gifts of body and psychic powers, become convinced that he was the Messiah. Since the expectations of such a being and to some extent his rôle had various types of preformation, nothing was more natural than that such a person in such a culture *milieu* and with such experiences should come to feel called to give this great hope a personal embodiment in himself and an original interpretation of his own. Thus he felt himself Heaven's aristocrat, too exalted to care for earthly dignities, and so he mingled with the masses, was friendly to the despised publicans, and even conversed with harlots, as Socrates was

reproached for doing. In his assumption of supremacy there is no trace of delusions of greatness. If he placed the crown of sonship upon his own head, it was because it belonged to him by intrinsic merit. Jesus' sense of celestial royalty under such circumstances and in his race and age was as normal as the belief of poets that they were the favourites of and visited by the muses, or of potentates that deity spoke in their deeds or of prophets that he did so through their words. It may not be our interpretation of him now, but no other was within his reach. If his description of these phenomena in his own soul has become obsolete and alien, its strangeness is because we are provincials of our own times and lack historic sense, knowledge, or *Einfühlung* for human nature when it is remote from us chronologically and ethnologically, and when it is subjected to far greater strains and tensions than are common in our civilization. The point is that any other sanest of men, with gifts, aspirations, and experiences like his, would then and there have come to the same estimation of himself; but there never was another thus circumstanced. This once fully realized, much else follows naturally enough. Of course, with such conceptions of himself, he would speak with authority and autodictic certainty, for Yahveh spoke through him more directly than he had ever done through the prophets. Those who did not understand felt his power, and no one ever disobeyed his command. The sick, told to arise, take up their beds and walk; the fisher-folk told to leave all and follow him, obeyed on the instant, wondering, doubtless, why they did so. This inborn sense of superiority gave him confidence in all he did and said because the spontaneous inner compulsion which he felt he deemed infallible, and the oracle that spoke through his soul seemed inerrant. Perhaps it was too implicit confidence in its deliverances that led him to trouble and finally to death. Had he not been fully persuaded that he was divine he would never have died, and had others not at last come to think him so, belief in his Resurrection could never have been established. Thus our first characterization of him is as one who above all others thought himself divine and has no less uniquely been thought to be so by innumerable others ever since his death. He believed himself a type, a superman or man as he was meant to be, realizing all the high legitimate ideals of old ascribed either to great men or to Yahveh.

(2) The trait that has now come to seem second only to this is

that he concealed this fondest and most dominant sense of inner divinity. As Socrates hid his knowledge by the mask of irony, in order to draw out others and then to convict them of ignorance, so Jesus lived, an incognito deity among his friends, because premature avowal of himself would spoil all. Keim, far more than any other biographer of Jesus, represents him, especially during the second part of the Galilean ministry, as often flying or retreating in order to escape his enemies. He did so, we are told, "in order to preserve himself for God and man," until he could carry his cause to Jerusalem. Eschatologists, especially Schweitzer, make him hardly less a victim of fear lest his Messianity should be prematurely disclosed. This might imperil his relations with even the Twelve. His eschatological secret must therefore be kept closely, and for the most part within his own breast, to the very end. Thus he taught with reservations, and often, especially in some of the parables, with intentional obscurity. His identity and his full program were thus undivulged and unsuspected. This reticence, whether from instinct or deliberate conviction, was a natural and inevitable consequence which developed concerning his own nature and function. It was not impossible that his disciples with their limited intelligence would deem him a victim of insane delusions, and at least his enemies would be sure to make the most of so commonplace an inference, and it would be very contagious, and thus, because of the very best that was in him, he would be thought mad. Greater yet was the danger that the Jews would regard a pretender to the sacred office of Messiah as guilty of sacrilege, while the Roman rulers would be only too prone to see in his claims a perpetual menace to their supremacy because they would think them prelusive of revolt. These several motivations for repression were together very strong, and could not fail to induce a state of psychic tension unprecedentedly great as well as constant. The result would be more or less vacillation, and that this is represented as great is very true to human nature. Feeling himself the repository of such a treasure, so fraught with ultimate good to others and so precious to himself, yet so beset by dangers that all might be easily lost before the day of fruition came, it would be strange indeed if he should not be anxious, tense, and ready at least to be a fugitive for his treasure's sake when he thought perils threatened, and at other securer moments should seem almost at the point of giving away his secret, as a kind of sacred trust committed to his favourites among

his esoteric circle, with whom he must have longed to share it. Without doing so he doubtless felt that their mutual confidence would be impaired should they ever know his secret. In this struggle, however, caution prevailed, and he went to death alone, without revealing the secret that lay closest and warmest about his heart. This itself was a unique and pathetic struggle with a heroic *dénouement*. It was not egoism or the lust of receiving homage that pleaded for avowal, or cowardice that made him flee. On the one hand, he may have felt it disloyal to Yahveh to hide it, and on the other he may have been ready to seem a skulking fugitive for its greater security. How frequent these alternations were, or how far they went each way, we do not know; nor is this so very essential. The point is that we have here a situation of tragic intensity with an attendant strain sustained we know not how long, but with no pathological traces either concomitant or in the sequel, and carried to the final issue in a way that has made it all the most psychodynamogenic in history. It is a story of supreme greatness surrendering self, disguised, humiliated, and yet in the end coming to its own. This is the truth that underlies and informs every romance and drama, and is the epitome of every great life that struggles, suffers, and achieves. It gives an ethical which is even greater than the hedonic narcosis, because it makes us feel that the world, whether beautiful or not, is morally good to its very core. Jesus was thus like a prince of royal blood who found himself alone in a hostile land without means or credentials which any one could be trusted to accept, and so thrown upon his own personal resources, but charged with the commission of organizing a counter-kingdom at short notice that would last until the invincible forces of his Father should arrive and sweep away all but the remnant that rallied about his Son, and establish them in the seats of power and honour forever. Everything thus depended upon his own initiative, sagacity, caution, and fidelity to his trust. This and the old and strong, though vague and polymorphic, hope-dream of a deliverer from within and of intervention from above—these two were his only resources.

(3) Under such strain and with such a high tension of opposite impulsions we have to think of the diagnosis of anxiety, the mother of all fears, and realize how many morbid psychoses might have arisen. He might have fled from such a reality and taken refuge in the old dreameries and vaticinations of the new Kingdom and its Lord, or

fallen into the old habit of watchful waiting. Instead of presentifying all the past and future in the here and now, one of the most all-comprehending traits of greatness, he might have evacuated them and lapsed to mere memories and hopes; or conversely he might have precipitated the issue by rushing prematurely toward his goal with the blind frantic zeal of a reformer whose motto is, "All or nothing and that now." Jesus did neither, but chose the hardest middle course. Now, what was the inevitable psychological effect of this strain? It was to keep him unusually alert, keen, augmenting to the utmost, and instead of paralyzing all his powers, to raise and keep them at their highest potential. Reserve energies would be mobilized, deeper unconscious strata would be tapped and drawn on, a higher efficiency equilibrium would be established, a state of psychic erethism would tend to become habitual, while the usual barriers of fatigue and all personal and social inhibitions would be transcended and new ranges of power attained. Mentation would be accelerated, will-power augmented, feelings intensified. The entire personality would be charged to its saturation point with available but latent energy, provided only that the incitement was in the direction of the all-dominant protension. What was this, and what did Jesus supremely want?

It was to prepare for the Kingdom which was just at hand, and the only means to this end was to make people believe in it and in him as its promised head; but instead of open avowal, he had to lay the foundations on which it could and would be surely built when all preparations were complete. The only possible course thus open to him was to impress himself, that is, his own personality, so intensely and favourably upon all with whom he came in contact, that they would sooner or later inevitably come to feel that he was himself no other than the true Messiah. This, then, was his task. Those he met, healed, taught, counselled, reproved or lived with, must be made to so love, admire, obey, depend on, feel in awe of him, that they would sometime inevitably come to realize that their feelings of affection, reverence, gratitude, dependence, and so forth, were the selfsame that were due to the Messiah, and that therefore he must himself be indeed nothing less or other than the Promised One. It was indeed a stupendous task with people so sluggish of soul. It must mean a re-education of so radical a sort that it might in some cases be well compared to arousal from the dead. But upon just this task all Jesus'

superior and very highly wrought powers were bent. In everything he did and said, from the choice of disciples to the final visit to Jerusalem, he was striving simply and solely to win full and spontaneous recognition for what he was. He put himself in the place of him whom the Baptist had announced as a successor greater than he; he healed, cast out demons, explained and fulfilled Scripture by turning the prophecies upon himself. He spoke with superhuman authority as Yahveh gave the law at Sinai, but was greater than Moses or the prophets; and he must, by his frequent withdrawals and prayer, have seemed to all about him in the closest *rapport* with Yahveh. All this, however, gradually seemed to him in vain so far as this supreme end of securing the unforced acclimation of himself as the one who was to come was concerned. When he thought he saw signs of this recognition in the converse or conduct of his disciples or followers or in the multitude, he was elated with hope, for the good seed seemed to have struck root and sprouted. But when they seemed cold or dense, his spirits sank. It sometimes seemed as if the very stones would shout his true function. But all the people who knew him remained dumb, blind, spiritually unilluminated. He had cast his pearls before swine, and so as a last resort he turned to the program of the pagan gods who had to be immolated before they were recognized and worshipped.

During all this period he was most assiduously at work in the only ways open to him in his desperate quest for identification, throwing himself with abandon into every opportunity, in conversing with individuals, flashing all the light that was in him into the dark recesses of the souls of either inquirers or critics, in such a way that each of these encounters must have seemed memorable to each of his interlocutors, inventing that most luminous and portative pedagogic instrument known as the parable, teaching his little school or circle, while wandering about, always ready to confer with individuals or talk to larger groups, healing all he could among those he met, organizing and launching his propaganda by proxies, helping the needy, defining his relations to the State, and, what was still more difficult, to the hierarchy and its hopes, altogether involving prodigious activity, while in it all he remained true to the functions of Messianity as he had come to conceive it. He was always eager and responsive toward every indication of any attitude by any one toward himself and his Kingdom, but all the while never quite came to the point of trusting

open avowal, though never ceasing to trust himself. It was an educational campaign unprecedented in the momentous issues at stake, in the brevity of time during which it must all be accomplished, and in the array of supernatural powers appealing to both hope and fear. The more we understand it, the more we marvel at the amount of inner and outer work Jesus put into it, the variety of resources devised and employed, the boldness and originality of it all, and the invincible pertinacity with which the supreme end was clung to and pursued through all the many and devious ways that were brought to converge upon it. The whole of life had to be reconstructed and brought under the light of new apperceptive centres in order to bring fitness to enter his Kingdom.

Then, when all seemed doomed to failure, Jesus' unconquerable soul refused to yield to despair but accepted his own death as the only means to the end of establishing the Kingdom, and this inevitably enhanced still more his psychic tension. His life must be offered up as a last resource, not only in order to make a still stronger appeal to the Father to intervene and bring the consummation, but as a final appeal for recognition. Death, especially in its most cruel and degrading form, if voluntary and as an act of devotion, beatifies the memory of the victim, and in the new light and warmth thus generated he hoped to be seen as what he was, for such a death would surely reveal him. But he must die aright with the issues clearly drawn and manifest to all. It must come in no obscure way, but openly, facing all the hierarchical and political powers that opposed the Kingdom. Thus, when the will to live ebbed over into the counter-will to die, the latter came not as outer fate, to be stoically resigned to, but as a freely accepted inner destiny. Moreover, every step downward to the tomb must be fully explored. Every counter-trend of the affirmation of life must be felt for all it could mean, for only thus could death be complete. This involved the still higher potentialization and the arousal of still deeper strata of latent energy. Because he was type-, race-, and also superman he had vastly more to sacrifice; death would mean more to him, and in a sense it would take more lethal energies to quell such a being. Even his soul had to die in despair. Hence, the tension always caused by impending death was not merely that caused in the soul of other heroes condemned and approaching the great shadow, but his soul must have experienced the greatest tension of any the world has seen. In his

public life, and especially in his closing scenes, more human trends were focussed into and thence irradiated from his own psychophysical system than any one else has yet attained before or since, and this makes him so dynamogenic. In his conscious and unconscious nature the best and highest moral forces before him converged, and from him they have since diverged. We have lately said and heard much of the higher powers of man, but here we have phenomena of an altitude which, though many have approached, none has ever yet attained, so that the psychology of Jesus remains the unique psychology of humanity at the acme of its insights and in the supreme *actus purus* of moral efficiency.[1]

Given such a being, charged with such functions and thus circumstanced, it follows necessarily that he would possess certain traits.

(a) The algedonic scale in which his life was lived out would be a very long one, running between the maximal degrees of pleasure and pain, or from the dignity of a God coming in all the Father's power and glory, to cruel and shameful death on the cross, abandoned by both God and men. This would involve a wide gamut of moods without implying any duality of nature in the sense represented above by Wünsche, and it would develop unusual capacity to both suffer and enjoy, as the *nisus* that impelled him was now blocked and now facilitated. Thus Jesus could pass all the way from the transfiguration to the garden without scathe or loss of psychic unity for he could endure, with no peril to complete normality and sanity, both the heights and depths of human experience. Extreme vicissitudes of fortune thus brought no dissociations, for keenly as he felt them he surrendered to neither fate, both living by and concealing his secret with perfect integrity of soul. He was inebriated by neither the cup of joy nor that of sorrow, deeply as he drank of both. Neither the exhilaration of hope nor, save at the last moments, the flaccidity of despair, could possess or sweep his soul from its moorings. Thus he could enter into the joy and sorrow of others, enjoy the good things of life, and not be enervated or lose the power to face any difficulty or endure any hardship. This temper and environment inclined him to gravitate not toward the indifference point, midway between pleasure

[1] K. Weidel: "Jesu Persönlichkeit; eine psychologische Studie." Halle, 1908, 47 p. Erich Haupt: "Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu in den synoptischen Evangelien." Berlin, 1895, 167 p. August Pott: "Das Hoffen im neuen Testament in seiner Beziehung zum Glauben." Leipzig, 1915, 203 p. O. Holtzmann: "Christus." Leipzig, 1907, 148 p. Johannes Weiss: "Jesus von Nazareth, Mythus oder Geschichte?" Tübingen, 1910, 171 p.

and pain, like a Buddhist saint approaching Nirvana, or the Stoic sage who strives to be above emotion, nor was he in danger of being caught at either extreme. Rather, he oscillated between both, so that now hope and now fear absorbed him. This both gave and presupposed that rare temper of spirit that could bend very far either way without either breaking or losing any of the elasticity of rebound. He also took both his pleasure and his pain in the things that he and man ought, because his primary orientation was moral. Hence the heaven and hell between which his life really moved were both in all their substance and reality within his own breast, so that both are eternal because in some sense they are essential to every moral consciousness that is complete. In the story of Jesus' preëxistence with God in heaven and of his descent into Sheol, we have only the crude patent imagery which strove to express this latent sense of the free ranging of his soul between the ultimate terms of euphoria and disphoria to which the sublime Semitic genius gave a moral interpretation, conceiving the longest dimension of man's universe as that which stretches between the two poles of good and evil. Thus Jesus did not live on a plain interspersed with hills or dark valleys, like most of us, but on a ladder the top of which was at the summit of hedonic goodness while the bottom went to the depths of sin and torture. Thus happiness and goodness on the one hand, and pain and sin on the other, are to such a consciousness one and inseparable.

(b) All men love and hate, but none as he did. Some follow the craven maxim, "Make no enemies," a coward adage of small shopkeepers or selfish politics, instead of choosing carefully some evil, in a world so abounding in it, and fighting it with might and main. No invectives were ever so charged with scorn, hate, and loathing as those he hurled against men who obstructed the way of the kingdom of righteousness. He pictured an assize of all the world, pronounced the sentence of doom upon the damned, saw God's wrath sweep away most of the inhabitants of the earth into the fiery realm of Satan, and our earth melting with fervent heat. Jesus' rage against iniquity and religious stupidity knew no bounds. Nor was there any reason why he should set bounds to it, for no anger can be too great against it. On the other hand, he was the world's greatest lover, for to love and serve God and man epitomized all his teaching, whether by precept or example. Love that is usually directed to parents, wife, or children, in

him was sublimated to the heavenly Father and to mankind. He longed to love his enemies, sinners, the outcasts, if they would only accept his love. All this the world knows by heart, but it does not realize how far any high degree of love or hate involves its opposite. We say he died as a love-sacrifice, but it is equally true that he died because of his irrepressible hate of the enemies of the Kingdom. Because of his stern suppression of his great secret as to who he was, the tension broke through in other directions where there was no such censorship, and here the vents were ecstasies of love and transports of hate to a degree that would not have occurred had there been no inner or outer check upon the open avowal of his Messianity, just as the same inhibition increased the ranges of his experience with pleasure and pain as we saw above. His love and hate were over-determined and hyper-accentuated by this hidden cause. The point is that his great repression must find vicarious or surrogate expression to relieve the inner conflict. We are but just learning the power of a suppressed wish and how it may dominate life, normal and abnormal, and also something of the mechanisms by which the energy generated by one group of either impulses or ideas may be transferred to others that seem remote from them. Hegel taught us that ideas, and psychoanalysis has shown that both feelings and impulses to action, go in pairs of polar opposites. This shows us that the ego or self is not the simple unitary thing it was thought but a group composed of the most varied elements, both conscious and unconscious, and very liable under strain to be broken up into its simpler components. Thus some rupture of continuity at whatever be the weakest point is especially liable to occur under great and prolonged stress and strain. Where this danger impels, the instinctive autotherapy is an intensified and especially varied play over all the gamut of affectivity, as we see in its pathological manifestations in the hypermotivity of hysteria. Manifest as these tendencies are in what we know of Jesus, they are, nevertheless, even when he seems to let himself go with abandon, always under the strong control of the higher moral purpose. Whatever his temperament, which may very likely have been that of a man liable to very strong passion, his cause was always supreme, so that to the most violent tempests that raged within he could always say, "Peace, be still" and be obeyed. We still need larger conceptions of his full humanity. We must insist upon putting *posse non peccare* in the place of *non posse*

peccare in conceiving him, and realize that to be tempted yet without sin is a harmatological as well as a psychological impossibility, and that to know sin is to feel it from within though not necessarily to have such acquaintance with it as Paul, Augustine, and others illustrate. To live under the power of a supreme wish supremely repressed would itself give a unique moral strength and also a sense of immunity, while it would at the same time impel one to explore all the possibilities of the tragicomedy of life. It would tend to maximize every response to every experience because of the principle, as true in psychology as in physics, that repression generates tension, and tension must seek every vent.

(c) The chief content of Jesus' consciousness was the Kingdom, and his chief purpose was to bring it in. His will, that impelled him to do any deeds that would advance it and resist any obstacles it encountered, was the entelechy of his life. To this not only feeling but intellect was subordinated. The latter was of a type hard for us to understand, not only because it was so Oriental in its florid pictographic imagery, but because it was of a type of mentation that has been more or less transcended. His was not only a prescientific but largely a prelogical age. Poetry was in the place now occupied by philosophy, and the day of systems of ordered thought had not dawned in his environment, so that the repressive influences of consistency were relatively unknown. Men thought by flashes, as spontaneous upgushes of impulsion dictated, and on the spur of occasion. Mental freedom was unharnessed by a knowledge of the laws of either nature or mind. The criterion of truth was the strength of the sentiment of conviction and certainty behind it. The modern taste for rationality was undeveloped. The eschatological writings and vaticinations of this age were the classic outcrop of this stage of mentation. That was true that was supremely willed or felt under the present stress. In a great genius under the pressure of desperate straits, fighting a hand-to-hand conflict with despair, we have the best paradigm of the struggle to survive and to validate its great affirmations. Nothing is so versatile, polymorphic, prolific in resources, so strenuous in all its various strivings, seems so many different sorts of man in turn, as now one, now another, side of his psychic microcosm appears. Under no other conditions has the individual such power to call upon the larger racial soul within him and to tap its almost limitless reserve energies; to

break through all the pannicules that separate men; to respond to the exigencies of a cause that transcends all such limitations; to be conservative or radical, old in wisdom or young in enthusiasm and vigour of action; to love now peace, now war; now to be meek, patient, and humble, and now aggressive and proud to a degree, able to run through all the diapason of temperament and even the greater one of moods, displaying traits usually conceived as predominant in the different races of men and even sects; to seem now naïve, now sophisticated, and self-conscious; to show the burgeoning of the different psychic diatheses that when fully flowered make optimists or pessimists, realists or idealists, pragmatists or devotees of the theoretical, contemplative, or even mystic life, and the rest; in a word, to show forth the basal humanity that makes geniuses, as it were, spectators of and participants in all events. We may thus now conceive such a being as Jesus, not as an unhistoric, syncretic artifact, but more, rather than less, real than others, because better representing the human genus and made natural by the fact that his cause embodied the supreme interests of the race.

(d) The newest psychology enables us now to understand, by no means fully but far better than before, a large group of phenomena most commonly found in religions, whether Christian, ethnic, or even most primitive, always more or less mysterious and very diversely interpreted. Most of them now have to be conceived as the efforts of the individual to come into his larger racial inheritance, or of consciousness to avail itself of its vaster unconscious resources.

A glance at the psychology of inspiration will help us here. R. Hennig,[1] who gives a bibliography of sixty-four titles on the subject, reported the testimony of some scores of prominent writers, living and dead, as to how their best work was done. Uhland said his poems wrote themselves. George Sand described herself as another being when she wrote. Mrs. Stowe did not know Uncle Tom was dead till she read it afterward. Hardy was often almost unconscious, and felt as if he were a medium. Some write as if suffering a seizure, and are curious afterward to know what they have done. Mozart did nothing, and could not remember, add to, or subtract from what was given him. Some do their best work when thinking of something else. Helmholtz wondered where his best thoughts came from. Goethe said that all the highest productivity and deepest *aperçus* are in no man's power.

[1] "Das Wesen der Inspiration." *Schriften d. Gesell. f. psychologische Forschung*, 1912. Sammlung IV, Heft 17.

Some describe themselves as above mundane influences, and others say their ideas seem to be presented to them. Something else uses them as a tool. Others describe themselves as looking on and having no part in it all. Stevenson described this as the work of the "brownies of the brain." Regnault spoke of this power as a "benevolent stranger"; and testimonies of this sort might be indefinitely multiplied. Once this elevation was thought to be caused by one of the choir of muses, by Urania or some other celestial patroness that had to be invoked or wooed.

Such experiences are commonest in religion, where they occur not only in the intellectual but in all spheres of life. For the Buddhist it was absorption; for the neo-Platonist, ecstasy; for Swedenborg, illumination and revelation; for Mohammed, the angel Gabriel; for the Shakers and Quakers, "the power"; for Fox, possession by the Spirit; for the modern Spiritualist, occupation of the place of his own soul by that of some departed great one or friend; for Christian Science, unconscious mind; for James, the higher powers of man; for Arnold, a power, not self, making for righteousness; for Socrates, his familiar spirit; for St. Paul, the Holy Ghost.

Under the influence of transmigration cults and theories, the adept, perhaps from some *déjà-vu* experience, thinks he has made contact with one or more of his own past lives. Karma teaches that every new birth is higher or lower according to the net sum of merit or demerit in the series of previous existences, as traducianists thought the results of Adam's transgressions were inherited. Plato thought to illustrate his doctrine of preëxistence and reminiscence by evoking a demonstration of the forty-seventh proposition of Euclid from the mind of the ignorant slave boy, Meno. The quest of ideas he thought was the quest for immortality. The philosopher loves and woos death in his passion to pass from the concrete and individual to the general and abstract. He seeks the transcendent, metaphysical, noumenal, and turns from the immanent and phenomenal; and once securely anchored to these deathless ideas, the soul shares their perdurability. New noetic experiences are often interpreted as a kind of letting out imprisoned powers into a larger freedom.

All these experiences or cults geneticism conceives as so many ways by which the individual gets into *rapport* with the genus, and is informed, facilitated, reinforced, or checked by its larger life and its all-

dominant interests, and the species in us is largely represented by the unconscious as the individual is by our conscious life. In prayer we hold converse with it, either as Christ, the embodiment of Mansoul, or the Son of Man, or else with the yet larger cosmic soul we are wont to call God. The story of Jesus represents the typical individual being subjected to the soul of the human phylum, and all the above phenomena are phases of the same process. An indefinitely long series of biographies would be needed to record the complete pedigree of each soul. This present personal life is only a day, or a single flitting mood or fancy representing one aspect of a larger, truer life which runs through the whole series, as the sense of a discourse pervades each of its single words and sentences, in which birth and death are only punctuation points. The fact that the soul has been immortal through such a succession of lives, is the best of all indications that it will live on with increasing momentum. Thus, in each individual but very little of the whole can be expressed; and the instinct to attain all-sided utterance in thought and deed, here and now, the stronger it is, is only a partial expression of the selfsame impulse that constitutes the promise and potency that will go over to other lives that spring from our own, till all the possibilities are exhausted, and till after having lived out all the orders of life, and having ascended through every stage of psychic metamorphosis, we rest in the end in the infinite from which we came in the beginning, and the cycle of evolution is complete.

The soul thus in seeking to expand itself, strives to draw on the larger life of the race within us. If the individual had been created *de novo* with no race history, with no psychic or other vestiges of his long pedigree, and no germs of future generations in him, it is hard to conceive how he could ever have sought general ideas or cared for any consensus *semper ubique et ad omnibus*, or sought for categories valid for all orders of existence, or how such a being could have felt any form of afflatus. This and even the speculative passion as Aristotle describes it in the contemplative life, charm and draw us because we inherit in an adumbrated way all the experience of our forbears, and remember them across thousands of birth and death nodes, and find them so much better, vaster, and stronger than we are. To draw upon this reservoir is the purpose of every ascetic cult, religious exercise or attitude, dance, or even drug. How to arouse these human energies, usually dormant in the individual, in a way to augment life

here and hereafter, and how to apply them in a practice of personal and social life in a way to conserve the best that has come to us from the past and to ensure perpetual progress, it is a great achievement of Christianity to have set forth, because in its study and practice we find the deeper unconscious racial soul of man incarnate as nowhere else. When tempted to escape his sentence, Socrates dreamed that the spirit of the laws appeared to him and reminded him that it was the citizen's duty to the state to remain loyal to it to the end. So, too, the beatitudes and about all of the sermon on the mount consist of injunctions to live for and in the community, almost as much as the individual ant or bee, which is often called the ideal citizen *socius*, does, and which Lilienfeld says in substance lives more in accordance with the precepts of the Lord's Prayer than do the members of any other gregarious species, not excepting the primitive Christian communities. Self must be developed to the uttermost degree that can make the individual a more efficient instrument of social service. It is only because and so far as self sets up as an end to itself that it sins and needs conversion. Reason must not obscure the light within. Wealth and power are trusts for the common weal. To love and serve man is to love and serve God, because God is the embodiment of man's ideal knowledge of his best self, personified and projected into the celestial regions. He is the source and end, the *alpha* and *omega* of man, and also of his earthly home. Every duty to God is a duty to the race and *vice versa* because of this identity. Every gift or aid within God's power to bestow really comes from the generic soul of the race within us, be it guidance, inspiration, help, wisdom, or energy. Converse with it is converse with God, and alienation from it is separation from him.

In fine, our religion has only three themes. The first is Jesus, the ideal yet historic individual who goes through the typical stages of adjustment to the deeper racial soul within him. The incidents of his life are paradigms, and the teachings directions how to live for and in the race. His end illustrates the extremest sacrifice the individual can be called upon to make for it. The soul of the race spoke through him more and more as his life unfolded, and when it had used all that was in him, flung him aside in a way the story of which makes it the quintessence of all great tragedy.

Second, Christ the Messiah is the soul of the ancient Hebrew race

as they conceived it. Great souls among them hoped for a unipersonal embodiment of it, and that the hovering ideal of it might actually enter history in flesh and blood. The more Jesus sought to incarnate this ideal of his stirp, the more under his influence and that of Paul and his other successors the conception of the totemic race-man broadened into that of a type-man of the entire human race, the concept necessarily becoming that of a true Son of Man. Jesus' life is to prepare his followers to make their own personal lives and character conform to the larger dimensions of humanity itself.

Third and back of man, is the cosmos. The Semitic Yahveh, originally the deity of a Kenite tribe, grew in the minds of the prophets till he took on more or less cosmic dimensions. He became the anthropomorphized and personified universe, its Creator and the embodiment of all that was good in it. His golden age, which culminated with the later prophets, began to wane toward a twilight or *Götterdämmerung* under two influences, first because the above Jesus-Christ cult, to which the New Testament and the early Church were devoted, stressed man and neglected nature; and second, because the spiritualization of ideas of God and the vastation of his nature in expanding from Yahveh to the God of all the worlds, the conception of which grew with the centuries, and especially since the men of science, made him too vast, vague, and afar to be grasped by any powers of man, so that now he is only dimly felt as a kind of "cosmic emotion" or an all-pervading power perhaps inspiring love of nature. The intellect does sorry work in seeking to make him apprehensible, whether in the form of theology or in conceptions of a controlling and perhaps interfering Providence, and for the rest falls back on poetry and antique mythology for its symbols and imagery.

(e) Even Jesus' death brought to his followers at first no glimmer of insight into who he or what his Kingdom was. They not only made no effort to save him (unless the story of Peter's impulsive and foolish act be authentic), but deserted him with no sign of either courage or fidelity. There is no record of any lamentation or mourning on their part. Peter denied all acquaintance with him to others, and if he wept afterward with remorse, he did it in secret. Socrates' friends stood by him to the end, and so did those of many a Christian martyr afterward, but the disciples of Jesus hardly seem to have shown common human sympathy with him even in Gethsemane. None offered

to come forward and testify in his behalf, or even attended him at the trial, or came to help him bear the cross or tried to comfort him as he hung upon it or even helped to bury him decently. Indeed, the very baldness of the narrative of his death with no attempt to improve the rare opportunities of pathos, which in the death story of so many other gods and heroes have been utilized with such moving power, is itself a cogent voucher of its historicity. His last cry might have been, "Why have my friends forsaken me?" If, as is often assumed, the motivation of the representation that he died alone was to enhance the pathos of his own anguish, this end was accomplished at the expense of the loyalty of his disciples. There is no indication that they would not all have been allowed to be present to the last, or that any of them sought to be. None of them ever interceded with him not to die, nor did any of them dream he would arise. Hence the only inference is that they thought his death the end of all, and therefore they must have felt that they had fallen victims to his delusions and must skulk back to their own environments and occupations, sadder but wiser men. Instead of remembering him with pride and joy it would be with mortification. If Jesus had hoped his death would bring the insights he had so longed for or that he would be rehabilitated in their souls for what they knew he was, he was doomed to bitter disappointment; for even in this forlorn hope all the Christianity there was in the world seemed dead forever and submerged in obloquy. The acme of the pathos of it all is not Gethsemane, the indignity of the trial, the nailing on the cross, or even the death in despair, but the simple record that his disciples having heard the rumours of his Resurrection regarded them as "idle tales and believed them not." This signified that all the efforts of Jesus to have himself and his Kingdom recognized by them had finally aborted, and that in this last crucial moment he was found to be dead indeed, buried in a rock he himself had hewn out in their own stony hearts, and sealed up there forever. This was the nadir of the diaspora of the Christian story. The disciples merely played a rôle not unlike that sometimes assigned to the chorus in Greek tragedy, serving as a foil to deepen the pathos of the hero's suffering by contrast. If the Jews and Romans slew Jesus' body, the stolidity and obtuseness of his disciples slew his soul. Their inner apathy withstood even Jesus' final appeal to awake, open their eyes, realize, believe. All the many reproaches uttered by Jesus con-

cerning hardness of heart, incapacity of soul or of senses, although directed to others, were meant for and merited by them. He hoped they would be the light of the world, but they extinguished his light in darkness. His tomb was their adamantine hearts, in which all his work and words, and even his memory, were sealed and guarded, to perish in oblivion.

This is the true story of Jesus to the end. It is all natural and normal, and what seems supernatural is in fact only our common humanity raised to a higher power, ideally developed and circumstanced to evolve its noblest possibilities. Its seemingly miraculous factors are all those of degree and not of kind, for there are no specifically heteronomous elements, and hence all are within the ranges of human experience and also of apperception, if only our powers of sympathetic imagination and moral *Einfühlung*, once given the technical name of faith and in which true humanity culminates, are kept alive and active. The new marvel and reality of it all is that it is so true to the psychology of human nature at its very best; for it depicts the highest achievement of which it is capable, and by the degree of approximation to which every other great achievement of man is to be measured and graded.

We now come, however, to the true marvel and miracle which psychology is not able fully to explain or even to understand, viz., how the belief in Jesus' Resurrection arose. Renan makes Christianity begin in the imagination of a single woman, that she had seen his wraith. Others think Peter first saw an apparition of him and that his experience became contagious, while others suggest that Paul's vision on the way to Damascus may have been the most important factor in the development of this great belief. Of course some assume a veritable ghost. Discrediting this last view, however, along with the crass conception of ancient orthodoxy of a reanimated corpse, and even discarding the theory of recovery from suspended animation, the problem of psychology is how without, or even granting, the last three views, the earliest Christians came to believe, and withal so passionately, in such an irrational and inconceivable thing. Would it have been possible for any kind or degree of human testimony to convince one who had not seen it of its truth, even had it occurred as a physical event? Or could one who had actually seen a dead man come back to life fully accept the evidence of his own senses? Would not

such an experience, in fact, be like a foreign body in his consciousness, unassimilated by it? If this would not have been the case then and there, in minds that had accepted belief in other restorations to life so that it would not be without precedent, nevertheless the modern mind would balk at such a surd, however attested. Granted the fact, the acceptance of it would itself be another psychological miracle. Therefore there is no alternative save to seek what explanation we can of what took place in the minds of Peter and Paul that made them believe; for if we ever find a key to it all, it must be here. Despite Peter's impetuous attestation at Cæsarea Philippi, the objective envisagement of the risen Jesus must have marked a crisis in his soul second in significance only to that of Paul's vision. Are there any known psychic laws by which to explain this experience, or any modern analogies that shed light upon any factors of it? Or is the mystery of it still entirely and hopelessly beyond our ken?

From the unharmonizable records of the Resurrection, the point on which there is most agreement is the resistance in the minds of the disciples to accepting it. Luke names three women "and other women" who told "these things" to the apostles, "and their words seemed to them as idle tales and they believed them not," although the Fourth Gospel says John and Peter had seen the empty tomb. Even these two, we are told, "knew not the Scriptures that he must rise again from the dead." Mark says Jesus first appeared to the Magdalene, a neurotic out of whom Jesus had cast seven devils. John says she knew him not at first but mistook him for the gardener. When upon his reproof she did recognize him, he forbade her to touch him, although he later made Thomas do so. Jesus told her, as the angel had done before, to tell the disciples. Mark says, "And they, when they had heard that he was alive and had been seen of her, believed not." Still they seem to have gone to Galilee as he directed, either to resume their old life or to accept the rendezvous he there appointed. Of the two disciples he met on the way to Emmaus, Mark says he was "in another form"; Luke says "their eyes were holden that they should not know him." He calmed their fears, explained the prophets, and only later as they sat at table did the disciples know him, and then he vanished. Mark says he "upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart because they believed not them which had seen him after he was arisen," and says "they went and told it to the residue;

neither believed they them." When he appeared in the midst of them and said, "Peace be unto you," Luke says that "they were terrified and afrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit." He showed his hands and feet, and told them to "handle" him, and reminded them that "a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." "They yet believed not for joy, and wondered." Then he ate before them, as if to still further prove his physical reality, and repeated his old teachings, partly as if for further identification, again explaining how he had to suffer, die, and rise. Thomas later had to be given a special private tactile demonstration of Jesus' corporeity and identity. Matthew tells of another appearance on an appointed mountain, and adds, "and when they saw him they worshipped him; but some doubted." Finally John says, "none of the disciples durst ask him 'Who art thou?' knowing that it was the Lord."

It is hard to understand how a being who could talk and eat, whose body bore wounds of the Crucifixion, and also who could be touched and who discoursed on wonted themes with his friends, should have such difficulty in convincing his followers, to whom the Resurrection from the dead was no new theme, either of his reality or of his identity as really risen. This shows how completely they had accepted his death. According to the records he did not regard himself as a ghost, or wish them to do so. Were he merely this, the tomb need not have been empty, for he could have passed through its walls with no need of having the stone rolled away just as he passed through closed doors, and gravity would not have to be reversed for him to ascend. Two causes worked toward facilitating their belief in his Resurrection, first a strong wish and will to believe it, for when it was fully accepted joy abounded in their hearts, as we see later at Pentecost, and secondly, they had not actually seen him die or seen him buried. These experiences, as psychic research statistics show, strongly tend to prevent survivors from thinking or dreaming that they see the ghosts of their just-dead friends. Personal experience with these last sad scenes tends thus to lay ghosts, because it brings home to even the unconscious regions of the soul, whence ghosts chiefly arise, a realization that friends are finally and completely dead. Had the disciples actually seen him crucified, expire, and sealed up in a tomb, and had they helped in these last rites, they might never have been able to accept the full belief that he lived again. As it was, this belief hung for critical

moments, hours or days, in suspense. This hesitation can only mean one thing, viz., that the sum total of all their impressions of Jesus as a companion had to undergo a great transformation before they could accept their friend and teacher as the Messiah, as he must be if he had really returned from the grave. The discrepancy between what they had formerly thought of him and the way in which he must now be regarded, in the light of this great achievement, was too wide to be bridged suddenly. Either there had been less in his deeds, traits, and teachings that was calculated to make them believe him supermortal than the record tells us, or else they were dense and unimpressed to this effect by intercourse with him, or perhaps both. Before they had only day-dreamed of his dignity, and now it was hard to awaken to it as a reality; for to accept it meant radically to revise all their memories and estimates of him. This involved very much inner work or travail of soul; and it would in a sense put him farther away from because so much above them, for their whilom friend would thus be transformed into a deity. Recognition of him as the latter would involve, too, a painful realization of their own stupidity when he was in full flesh and blood with them. Moreover, to rest everything upon something so incredible, "to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness," would be a *salto mortale* that would most flauntingly challenge doubt and draw ridicule upon their work, for they would be thought credulous, superstitious, ignorant, and fanatical, if not victims of insane delusions. Such an avowal would mean to enlist in a most arduous world campaign of propagating a cult to accept which would involve a reversal of all current values, to call men to hate what they had loved and burn what they had worshipped, and persecution must have at least vaguely and half unconsciously been forefelt. The issue was indeed staggering.

But if it was hard to believe and cast all resistances to the wind, it was harder yet not to do so. Whatever the nature of the sense-presentiments they may have had of his post-mortem return, however faint they may have been, these could not fail to arouse a mass of affective tendencies in their favour. Presentiments of his greatness, which they had felt before but which had been so effectively suppressed, now burst through or at least strained every leash that held them from complete realization. What his death may have made them think had been the result of his folly, now was triumphantly vindicated as

transcendent wisdom. The wishes and hopes they had hardly dared to indulge now made their hearts bound and burn within them because they might become true. The optative passed into the indicative mood. The teachings they had warmed to were not false but true. If there was even mortal danger it would reck little, because the king of terrors had himself been slain, for death was gain and not the loss of all. Item after item of their reminiscences of him began instinctively to be illuminated by higher meanings. Belated and arrested responses to his insistent incitements began to find voice within them. Moreover, such extreme depression as they had lately experienced had to react toward the opposite of euthymia. The skeptical consciousness could not maintain itself against the affirmations that arose from the submerged momentum of the cumulative impressions he had left upon their deeper and better nature. So at last all breakwaters of reserve and doubt were swept away by a rising tide of belief, and in this meagre account we have the story of how the current of history began to flow in new channels. It was as if the world waited in breathless suspense for a moment to see whether these Galilean peasants would come to believe or not to believe that their dead master had come back to life.

The full conviction that Jesus had risen, slow, hard and revolutionary as it was, dawned apace. Many came to believe that they had seen and recognized him on various but always brief occasions. It was a fulfilment of an intense, deep, and more or less unconscious wish, which, if strong enough, always finds or makes its own realization. These were days of expectant tension among the faithful. Perhaps some hoped or longed in vain for sight of him, while to others he manifested himself to several senses. Some, doubtless, had a *sensus numenis*, or a feeling of personal presence or reveniance that was not defined. Indeed, when not seen he might be among them, and some might expect a visitation at any place and any moment. Some believed on testimony, while others doubted or remained in suspense. He certainly showed no disposition to resume his old relations with his comrades. That and his psychophysical nature doubtless seemed to them to have undergone some great change as a result of what he had experienced. He could not remain with them permanently on the same basis as before, not even if he were a mere *Doppelgänger* of the new social consciousness of this group of his whilom companions. All these experiences might be a dream, while the more sarcous he was, the

more difficult it would be for him to maintain consistently and constantly such a falsetto existence as was now ascribed to him. Therefore the folk-soul, since it could not make him more crass, had no alternative but to sublimate him still more, and therefore he was made to ascend beyond a cloud with an angelic promise that he would sooner or later return from thence. Thus he also vanished from the present into the future tense, and this is interpreted as return to his former home, from which he watches and guides until he comes back in power and glory. Thus the cycle is complete, and his followers must turn from gazing up into heaven, realize and assimilate their experiences, and orient themselves and agree upon some practical program as the entire apostolic college straightway began to do under Peter's guidance.[1]

And now the full meaning of all their experiences as a whole, from their call in Galilee to the cloud that shut Jesus from their view, came over them. All seem suddenly and at once to have realized what Jesus took himself to be and really was while he was with them. All that he had striven, even to the tragic end, to make them realize concerning himself, but hitherto in vain, burst upon them. Jesus' great secret stood forth revealed to them in all its significance. Were he among them at this moment, there would be no longer any reason or cause for his long painful reticences, reserves, inhibitions, and fears to avow himself. His own sense of divinity could be indulged in without limit in this little new circle. At last he was discovered and understood for what he really was. His death, supplemented by experiences that indicated his reveniance from it, had consummated in their souls his work while with them, and his supreme wish and desire for them were now realized. The crude symbolism and imagery of Pentecost and the account of the gift of the Paraclete mark the arrival of Jesus' followers at the goal of Jesus' chief endeavour for them. The supreme act of the Holy Spirit is in its very essence establishing belief in the Resurrection and all that it implies, and this is described as the gift of the Holy Ghost. Christian faith was invented as the special organ of this function, and it has no other content. The Spirit designates a high degree of the energy by which that organ does its work.

If this little band had merely dreamed or hallucinated their late companion back from death and up to the Father, and if such a complex had once become firmly established in their minds, even as a

[1]K. Lake: "The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ." New York, 1907, 291 p.

foreign body forced upon their credence from without by the insistence of false sensations, then a process of assimilation and intussusception would have at once begun about such an apperception mass, or else mental unity and integrity would be lost. Rapid as this process of unification was, and far as it went, it has never yet been completed, so that the Christian consciousness has always remained more or less dual, and flesh and spirit, sight and faith, this world and the next, have always stood more or less over against each other. Jesus from this point on, too, in a peculiar sense has had two lives, one in humiliation and the other in exaltation, and in these two states the old antithesis between the real and the ideal took a new and most pragmatic form. Now the pneumatic took great and sudden precedence over the sarcous. Now the unseen and transcendent dominated the seen and immanent world as never before. The body and present life waned before the soul and the next life. This momentous change was wrought out, not by eschatology alone, but was chiefly caused by, and, indeed, consisted in, accepting the Resurrection, which is the *fons et origo* of Christian idealism. The old Greek unity and harmony between soul and body were gone, and henceforth man was predominantly soul, and body only in a secondary sense. The leader of this little band had documented himself beyond all cavil as a celestial being for whom death was only an emancipator, and they were not only of his race but his intimates, and therefore, like him, celestial and deathless. In discovering what he really was they discovered what they were and also what others could become. Never before had humble or even exalted men thought so highly of themselves. What matters it to us, now that the old theology of a vicarious atonement has lost its power, just how much of the Resurrection was material fact, and how much was product of a highly wrought imagination? Belief in it has done and will long continue to do its work, and so it is most real by every pragmatic sanction. Henceforth soul cults were not only detached from but made far superior to body cults.

Thus the Holy Spirit, which was the soul of the dead Jesus, passed into his successors. Thus at last on the day of Pentecost they caught his inspiration and came for the first time into vital *rapport* with him, and their lesser minds were frenzied by the muse from heaven which he had sent them. In the aura of their ecstasy their over-wrought eyes, which had lately seemed to see the spectral form of their Lord, now saw

red flickering flames over one another's heads as symbols of their new enlightenment, and perhaps of fiery tongues to proclaim it. Their ears rang as the wind pipes, as if a new spirit of the air were abroad. Instead of listening to the risen Master's words they heard one another in an access of glossolalia, speaking strange tongues, as if of the races they were about to preach the Gospel to. They raved like frantic sybils when the mantic spirit enters them, and these all seem to have been phenomena which Jesus had never anticipated. They were indeed drunk, not with new wine, but with the new mystery of the Resurrection and what it implied, and with the burden which they felt was now laid upon their souls to rescue others from their own long ignorance and density. Through all these pregnant days before the apostles dispersed, Peter stands forth as the great leader and compeller of souls. He tempered their crude and wild enthusiasm and gave it practical directions, informed their zeal with wisdom, rehearsed the outline of Jewish history as it must henceforth seem in this new light, established community of goods, gave object lessons in healing as well as teaching, in confuting enemies and unmasking pretenders, making with their novice aid thousands of converts, steeling their courage by his own heroism to meet persecution, in his vision of the sheet transcending the narrow limits of Judaism and insisting that the great message was for all the gentile world, and by this and many other means developing step by step the primitive apostolic constitution.

The second and only other great miracle in the New Testament, also psychological, is the conversion of Paul, who experienced his Pentecost on the way to Damascus, which made him another Neander or new man with a new name, as Peter was renamed. His change also is not entirely inexplicable or supernatural. About Jesus' own age, he was born in Tarsus, a cosmopolitan trade and also an academic city, so that he may have "drunk from the springs of Helicon as well as from those of Zion," although it was also the seat of Baal worship with its rank orgies. About the age and time when Jesus first visited the temple, Paul went to Jerusalem and studied the Scriptures with Gamaliel, a Pharisee of great learning and breadth of mind, who was said to have counselled the Jews not to persecute the Christians because if their cause was of man it would come to naught, and if of God they could not exterminate it. He had consented to and seen the death of Stephen calling upon God to forgive those who slew him. He inherited

Roman citizenship from a prominent father, and was a man of rare vigour of mind and body. His rabbinical training and temperament made him a zealous proselyter, and he may have secretly hoped to see Judaism pervade the Roman world, at least in the East. The rapidly growing Christian community, however, endangered this ideal, and so he became the most active antagonist that we know of this new sect. He persecuted its members from place to place with relentless cruelty and fanaticism, commissioned by the rulers and, as he thought, by God, to crush out their pestiferous cause. Had he persevered in this work, the very apostles might have fallen and Christianity have died in its infancy. Many fled to distant parts for fear of him, perhaps sowing the good seed afar which Paul was destined later to help them cultivate.

But now occurred an event of which it is impossible to harmonize the various accounts. According to the more objective versions of it made by others, Paul was on a six days' journey of some one hundred and sixty miles, across a desert, a condition favourable for orientation, when in the oppressive heat of noontide he seemed to see a great light more dazzling than that of the sun, and to hear a voice which he ascribed to the risen Jesus saying, "Why persecutest thou me?" He fell blinded and perhaps unconscious, was led to a retreat, fasted three days, then recovered his sight, and we hear nothing of him for some years. Commentators have conjectured sunstroke, a very heavy and near thunderbolt, somnolence, a startling, painful dream with nightmare symptoms, or an access of epilepsy. There is much diversity in the record, nor do we know just what, if anything, his companions saw or heard. Paul's own allusions to this experience are less dramatic and objective, but make it no less epochal, for he there met the risen Jesus and was transformed in doing so. The subject of such experiences can never give any very lucid account of what befell him, but has to be content with somewhat futile tropes and symbols. Whatever the spectral and phonic features here are, it is certain that we can never get very far away from the sphere of subjectivity. Hence, the all-important thing is not what occurred but how Paul interpreted this crisis, which was that he had actually envisaged in the spiritual and risen form the very Jesus whose followers he was persecuting, and had experienced a kind of transporting ethical narcosis in his presence, which left him both fascinated and dismayed. The Christophany vouchsafed him had inebriated him with an ideal of

transcendent and triumphant virtue, far above that which he had long striven to attain in himself but in vain. He had seen the second spiritual Adam, the Christ than whom he thenceforth resolved to know nothing else, but he must take up his abode in him and also unite him with God. But such interpretations did not come on the instant, but later, as a product of years of meditation which were necessary to assimilate such a new and anomalous experience. He had to reconstruct in a new form all his shattered views of life, and to recover complete sanity after a shock that seemed to have destroyed his old personality and to have established a new one within him, viz., that of Christ that had exorcised the truculent demon of persecution in him and taken its place.

Was this experience, or the *volte-face* it caused, a miracle, or only a challenging but not insoluble psychic enigma? In the years of retreat and incubation, perhaps solitary and possibly convalescent, Paul could not help recalling his mingled feelings as he had seen Stephen's death, and also as he remembered the mild and tolerant teachings of his old preceptor. The "pricks" which he found it hard to kick against were those of his own conscience. It was very doubtful whether either the Sanhedrin or the best elements in the Judaism of Paul's day would have sanctioned his truculence, or whether the group of believers in Christ was large or formidable enough to be a source of great danger; and certainly the spirit of the great prophets would have condemned such persecution. It may have been prompted by slanderous reports about the new sect, which, however, their bearing under his cruelties was doubtless tending to discredit. The above facts constitute an *ensemble* of influences that before the expedition to Damascus were undermining and repressing his antagonism, and so preparing the way for a revolt in his soul against the course he was pursuing. The majority of his impulses was warring against a silent but growing minority of them which was soon to come to power.

(a) But other more personal preformations of the impending change we find in the extreme moral dualism that characterized his life. His whole soul longed and strove for righteousness under the law, but he found great resistance in the "flesh." His spirit craved and strove for God and purity, but the lust of his members always stood in the way till he prayed to be delivered from the "body of death." The strength of his ethical nature made him aspire to nothing less than moral per-

fection, but the requirements of the Hebrew law were complicated and impossible of literal fulfilment, while the impetuous passions of the physical man, in which concupiscence may and may not have played a prominent part, made his ideals seem unattainable. The good that he longed to do he did not, and the evil that he hated, that he did. Thus he interpreted the war within him of the flesh with the spirit, although how much of this conflict was due to exceptionally high ideals of virtue and how much to exceptional strength of baser propensities in him we do not know, but both may have been extreme. It was doubtless in no small part to relieve this inner strain that he became a ravening wolf to the Christians, being exceedingly mad against them, breathing out slaughter, forcing them to blaspheme, thus wreaking upon them the wrath he really felt against his own better nature, as anger is so prone to vent itself upon another object than that which excites it, by the law of transference. He doubtless hoped also thus to atone by supererogatory zeal for his own sins.

In the midst of this desperate struggle with himself, which he always conceived as between body and soul, or spirit, came the apparition of a real discarnate spirit that in sloughing off the body had escaped the source of all sin and was thus above the temptations that racked his own soul. In this he saw actualized before him something like that which his own better self had long striven to become, and if relieved of mortal errant flesh might approximate. Identifying as he did this visible immortality with the Great Teacher whose cause he in his folly and madness had sought to bring to naught, he came to the great realization that what he had persecuted was in fact in very deed and truth his own better self, beatified and idealized. This reproved him and called him to awake and turn. It also gave him assurance of victory in his moral battles, brought great peace as that after a long storm, and inundated his soul with hope and faith. Paul conceived it as an ecstatic experience which exalted him above his old life and filled his soul with new and unique joy, loyalty, and devotion. He had found his ideal, or rather, himself idealized.

Another predisposing cause of his conversion was doubtless considerable knowledge of the Christian story of the cross, and probably, because they were all about him, of some of the cults of dying and rising gods, or of the pagan Christs with soteriological functions, while beneath all, like a tidal wave (that bears many lesser systems of waves

down to the tiniest ripples from a breeze), was the pendular nature of his affective life reinforced by the sequence of autumn and spring, which makes it prone to swing over from every extreme state into its opposite. Thus there were in his own soul disapprovals of his course as persecutor arising from human sympathy with his victims, whom he found to be not wolves but lambs, while the violence he was doing to the more poised minds like that of Gamaliel would reinforce the reaction. All these inclinations he had doubtless felt, fought down, or sought to evict from his consciousness, and keep out by setting a censor over them, but they persisted in coming back now in great force.

(b) His personal struggles against sin and toward perfection, and his high standards, which gave him a horror of moral inferiority or mediocrity, had brought him to conceive his body as the source of all iniquity and his spirit as the quintessence of all that was good. Thus an ocular object-lesson demonstration of a most real and perfect soul set free from its sarcous prison, was an inspiring vision.

(c) Death and rebirth in all the ethnic cults went together and were eternal complements of each other. In them what dies rises again. The formula of every tragedy is first pain and last victory. The first flash of synthesis between these hitherto more or less isolated psychic constellations, the life and death of Jesus and that of the pagan Christs, would cause a psycholeptic crisis sure to moult the old consciousness and reveal the new and better one that was growing beneath it. Paul's experience is thus the classic paradigm in the normal religious realm of which there are very many analogies but none upon the same high plane, e. g., the crises of Constantine, Augustine, Bunyan, and many others described in the current psychologies of conversion. In mid-adolescence, e. g., the larger life of the race often seems to burst upon the youthful soul that has hitherto lived only in and for itself, leading it captive to the larger life of the race which demands service and altruism. Again, love often has a period of unconscious latency or incubation, during which it may be silently growing in the depths of the soul even toward the very persons the subject of the passion believes that he only fears, fights, and hates. So, too, those in whom rage has done its worst and burned out, may turn to pity and even love their victims. Once more, it is a pregnant psychogenetic law that the indulgence of some base propensity or a fall into sin may arouse the next higher power that inhibits and sublimates it, and so advance the

wrong-doer to a more highly evolved evolutionary plane where, but for sin, its normal corrective would never have come into function. Or again, as toxins stimulate the development of antibodies in the blood, which act as their antidote, so Paul's struggles with sin aroused the countervalent lust for holiness which could not only give immunity from wickedness but cast it out.

As a result of this crisis Paul's life was shattered and lay in ruins, and the new and larger personality that was forming beneath merged into his consciousness; but it was callow, inchoate, fragmentary, or like early infancy when it most needs protection. A larger synthesis of all the above elements was necessary if integrity of soul could be attained. New theories, new directions of will, new feelings, must be syncretized into a far more complex unity and a higher sanity attained, or else hopeless disintegration would ensue. All these problems of autopsychotherapy which Paul faced had, however, a remarkable solution in the working out of which he became the world's greatest psychologist of the regenerative processes. All the many latencies within him were heard from, and in place of the old shattered self another one that seemed to him so much larger and better that it could not be his own, arose. He thus achieved a new and far more complete wholeness or holiness above all the old disharmonies so that he was twice saved, once from these and again from the effects of the shock of his disruptive crisis. The self-reëducative and regenerative powers of a new ideal and a new affection were thus supremely illustrated in the change which turned Saul the inquisitor into Paul the apostle, which changed the slave of the letter of the law into the exponent of a perfect, because not antinomian, freedom. While we have no systematic confessional of the travail of Paul's soul during his silent years, such as psychoanalysis would desire for a *Tatbestandsdiagnostik*, or even of the kind represented by other types of extreme changes, e. g., Rousseau, Faust, Hamann, we do have many precious glimpses in the Pauline epistles of the process of "*fides quaerens intellectum*" or of *pistis* seeking *gnosis* like capital seeking investment. The problem he now faced was, how can the spirit of the Jesus whom he had seen, enter the life of man? By what tropes, analogies, allegories, symbols, rites, institutions, can this new experience be expressed and inundate thought, feeling, and will? How can the precious bullion be minted into current coin of the realm? It was hard enough for Paul to come to a full

realization of what had happened to himself, but much harder to find ways and means of giving others, even gentiles, the benefit of the heavenly treasure he had found.

(1) Two chief means, however, were at hand. The first was gnosticism. The point of contact of the new sense of Divine Sonship with gentile thought was first made in the domain of Greek life through the medium of its philosophy, which had long since demonstrated its efficiency and economy as a means of grasping the universe as a whole and to which Hellenic thought, from Anaxagoras down, had contributed its riches. In Paul's day it was most popularly known in the form of the logos doctrine. The Divine Word was conceived not only as the reason and wisdom inherent in nature, but as active in and creative of it. It bore to the thought of that day a relation very like that of thought in the logic of Hegel, only that it was essentially transcendent rather than immanent. The Word was the rationality by which things were made, with at once the archetypal or constitutive value of Plato's ideas and the normative or regulative force of Aristotle's categories. This gnosticism was the last word of generations of Greek thought, and gave to it most of the unity that it possessed. No formula ever perhaps had more epoch-making historic significance than the simple equation, "Jesus is the *Logos*." This pass-word admitted Christianity to the whole system of Greek thought, and irrigated it with fertilizing streams. It was the basis of a network of theory and demonstration which widened and irradiated for centuries. It opened all the field prepared by the conquest of Alexander and gave a personal positive moral content which almost made the previous culture of Greece appear to be another propadeutic Old Testament to the new Gospel. Greece, however, lacked and could not understand Messianism, while the Semitic mind could not conceive the identification of an historic individual with a metaphysical principle, so that the above equation was as strange to the Jews as it would be to us now to equate him with, e. g., science. This conception of him as the *Logos* later tended to make enthusiasm evaporate into doctrine and to put creed in the place of faith and theology in that of religion. Had Christ been equated with will, which makes conduct, or with the *nisus* of evolution or the biologos, how different all would have been! But happily because it was related to the idea of sonship the logos was also conceived as spermatic, and this conserved vital roots even

though they were subordinated. Harnack may be right in his view that it was necessary to rigidify orthodoxy in order to make headway against polytheism, idolatry, and the various heresies, and to establish a solid basis for Church organization, but this did not keep out the theocrasias or prevent saint worship from taking the place of polytheism or canonization of the apotheosis of heroes. Still the psychologist who puts an ever higher valuation upon subjective processes and believes in their ultimate triumph cannot help raising the question whether the noetic element in Paul's exposition of the new religion was not over-emphasized, as would be natural in a religion that was propagated so intensely and so largely by preaching, and whether his intellectualization of his own experience was not better calculated to make than to hold converts. Hard and long as he strove to do so, Paul never explained either himself or Christ. He was not a philosopher or clear thinker but a mystic, more articulate, to be sure, than minds like Boehme or Eckhart, but his mind was essentially ejaculatory, teeming with brilliant phrases, seeing new *aperçus*, rich in metaphors and even in epigrams. He was a prose poet, often a rhapsodist, and far greater as an organizer than as a thinker. It is idle to seek in his writings for evidence that he had ever grasped the doctrines of the great Greek thinkers, or even the essential principles of Stoicism, of which he seems to have known as little as he did of the life and teachings of Jesus. Even his gnosticism was only that of a novice and amateur, and the best that can be said of it is that it was sufficient for the immediate purposes he had in hand, like a mariner's knowledge of astronomy.

(2) The other great influence Paul represented is seen in the most significant fact that he knew Jesus almost solely as crucified and risen, and seems to have known or cared little else about him. From his writings alone we should know almost nothing else of Jesus. Now, death and revival were central themes of most of the religions of near Asia and ancient Egypt and Greece. The idea of dying and reviving deities was the root of about all the ancient mysteries. Back of all were the countless rites commemorating the death of vegetation in the fall to ensure its return in the spring, in which autumn sadness ebbs into vernal joy. Winter is driven out by May queens.

But as culture advanced, the desire to secure vernal resurrection in plant life merged over into that to secure the revival of human life after death. Osiris, originally the god of vegetation, was slain by the

demon of summer heat, personified as his brother Set. The day of his death was celebrated by mourning, which two days later passed over into joy unbounded at the recovery of his body by Isis. So the death of Adonis was mourned one day, and the next his resurrection and translation into heaven were commemorated. In some versions he, like Persephone, spends half a year in the underworld, and the other half in the upper. So Attis, the lover of Cybele, the great mother, mutilated himself to death, and this was celebrated symbolically by the priest, who wounded his arm as if to follow in the footsteps of the god. The fourth day came the feast of joy, celebrating his resurrection. The history of Demeter and the recovery of her daughter were the theme of the Eleusinian mysteries, which are traced back to spring and fall myths, but later attained the significance of a pledge of blissful life after death. Dionysus, like Osiris, with whom some identify him, was commemorated by tearing a bull to pieces by the teeth of the worshippers who in devouring the bleeding flesh partook of the immortal life of the god incarnated in the bull. Allied to the violent deaths of the gods are the legends of the voluntary descent of a god or hero to the underworld and his fortunate return. The Babylonian Ishtar did this to restore her lover Thammuz, and again to fetch back the waters of life. She was admitted only after threatening to break down the doors of hell and on condition that she must leave one garment at each of the heavenly gates, so that she entered the nether world quite naked. She was imprisoned here and inflicted with sixty diseases. This removal of the goddess of fertility threatened to end human and animal life until a hero was sent to ensure her return, which she effected, regaining a garment at each gate. Thammuz was washed in the water of life and anointed with oil, and then in place of the death dirge came merrymaking with pipes. The gates of the underworld were finally broken down and the dead delivered from their prison. In a well-known gnostic hymn we are told how the soul wanders in the labyrinth of life with no escape. Christ implored the Father to send him to its relief. So he wandered through the aeons, disclosing all secrets, delivering souls from Hades, protecting them from demons by mystic names and formulae. In the Gospel of Peter, Christ declares that he had preached to those that slept, meaning that between his death and Resurrection he had descended to hell and revealed himself as the Lord of its inmates. Thus the hard yoke of death was broken, and hence

the shouts, "Death, where is thy sting?" The heavenly watchmen see the booty won and cry, Lift up ye gates that the King of Glory may come in!—gates which were originally the ice and snow of winter. So Odysseus, Hercules, Theseus, and Pythagoras descended to the realms of Orcus.

The ancients quite commonly deemed death a result of supernatural causes, and for the Semites it was a penalty, deliverance from which must be either propitiatory or by vicarious sacrifice, in which the cleansing power of sacred blood played a great rôle. Death must be defeated in his stronghold. Christ imparts life either by faith in his name, by baptism, or by the Lord's Supper. The belief that the innocent sufferings of the good have great vicarious power first appeared in Isaiah liii, and again in the Fourth Book of the Maccabees, and it dominated the Jewish custom of animal sacrifice. Among the Greeks the placation of the anger of the gods was the motif of many purification rites in which sometimes human beings were sacrificed, first commonly, then annually, later at great public calamities. The transition from human to animal sacrifice is seen in Abraham's offering, and also in Iphigenia. Human sacrifices were very common among the Canaanites; and everywhere the greater the worth or rank of the life offered, the more effective was the sacrifice.[1] In great danger the ruler or his son might be the victim. The Carthaginians thought their defeat, B. C. 308, due to Baal's wrath because they had sacrificed slaves instead of children of noble family and so cast into the furnace one hundred children, and three hundred more offered themselves. The efficacy of royal children was due to the belief that deity was incarnate in the king.

Ascension myths have many forms. A hero becomes a favourite of the gods, and therefore they take him to themselves. Leaders may be caught up in ecstasy, so that we have here the motive of eschatological stories of voyages of pious souls after death. The Hebrews knew of only two cases, that of Enoch, who was translated, and of Elijah, who went up in a fiery chariot. These were more common among the Greeks where the hero may be taken to the Elysian fields or islands of the dead, caves, or the depths of the sea, or Olympus. Originally the man was transferred, body and soul, without death, as in the case of Hercules and Romulus. The former was the son of Zeus and a human mother, and so continued to battle with fate and with Hera, but

[1] See here Pfleiderer: "Early Christian Conceptions of Christ." London, 1905, 170 p.

overcame death in this and in the lower world, conquering Cerberus, delivering Prometheus, and at last voluntarily ascending from his funeral pyre. Many mythic heroes of heavenly birth return heavenward. Caesar was raised to the rank of a god by official decree, and the soul of Augustus after his death was seen in a comet. A praetor swore that he had seen the emperor's soul fly up from the funeral pyre to heaven. After Peregrinus had thrown himself into the pyre at Olympia, a man declared that an eagle flew up from the flames into heaven. So, too, the fact of the apotheosis of Apollonius was said to be proven because his grave could nowhere be found on earth.

So the apocalyptic Jesus is exalted as Lord of Lords, head of the Church and universe, etc. So the disciples of Buddha hailed him as God of Gods, Saviour, Father, joy, light of the world, jewel of the universe, King of physicians, holy, before whose glory sun, moon, and fire shine no more, the miracle of three thousand worlds. He is addressed as "My beloved, my riches, greatness, life," as omniscient, as yet accessible to prayer although he has entered Nirvana, because he is the eternal Spirit of salvation. Marduk of Babylon was also adored as king of kings, finisher of creation, and such superlative terms have also been applied to Ammon-Ra in Egypt, Ahura-Mazda in Persia, etc., all illustrating the same need of the soul that was expressed in the apotheosis of the historic Jesus who, however, alone had the unique power of renewing humanity. Pfleiderer says that the chief rival of Jesus in early centuries was not Mithra, as is commonly said, but the Roman emperor. Of Augustus it is said that all things would have sunk to ruin if this son of universal joy had not arisen and brought regeneration. He came as a saviour. "In his appearance the hopes of our forefathers are fulfilled. He has not only surpassed all former benefactors of mankind, but it is even impossible that a greater than he should ever appear. A new era must begin from his birth." Thus emperors were thought incarnations of deity.

But the point here is that the Christian idea of an eternal son of God who became man, died, descended to hell, conquered death and Satan, rose from the dead, ascended to heaven, sits at the right hand of God, will come to judge the quick and the dead—all these articles are found in religious cults of the East, not once but many times. What these lack, however, is a single subject for the synthesis of all these predicates, a nucleus around which this seething mass of religious

concepts can crystallize into a new world of hope and faith for the present life and for that which is to come. It was precisely this that the Pauline risen Jesus gave. Thus the best in the old heathen mysteries was incorporated into Christianity, so that in it members of these old faiths saw each their own cult completed and glorified. The progress of the primitive Church thus did not consist so much in transplanting the religion from one ethnic soil to another, nor is it adequately described as cross-fertilization of religious cults, but Paul was enough Jew, Roman, and Greek to inaugurate a new blending of strains.

In the new light now shed on Paul he stands revealed more as the apostle of than to the gentiles. His movement took the pagan cults of dying, rising, and glorified deities and heroes, Semitized and synthetized and in general edited, and took them back in a sublimated form to the people about the Mediterranean who had long known them in their own cruder and more imperfect forms. What he preached to them was their own cult-categories made over and attached to a Hebrew hero whom he and Peter had apotheosized in a way even better calculated to meet gentile than Hebrew modes of thought and feeling. This goes far toward explaining the marvel of the rapid spread of early Christianity. It was a revival of the old ethnic cults which were restored, their lacunae filled out, their themes of belief and rite given new names, the deeper human needs they had met embodied in a new legend, so that Mithra, Osiris, and the other dying and rising deities could be worshipped again and in unison under the common name of the risen Christ. Hence the great power ascribed to "his name," for the conversion of the gentiles was largely to a new name, the only name whereby they were told they could be saved. This was a great achievement of the Semitic genius, a possibility, which, however, as we have seen, Jesus anticipated when at the close of the first period of his career he turned his face toward death. All the ingenuity that Paul and most Christian writers have since shown in tracing the origin of the dying-rising concept to the prophets is somewhat misleading, for no fact is now more sun-clear to every unprejudiced student who can rightly evaluate culture forces than that this was distinctively gentile. The new faith did not destroy but fulfilled the preëxisting religions with which it came in contact, even more than it did the Old Testament. Psalms and prophets could be retained, much of the rest of the old canon allegorized, while what was left became ineffective, and

under the influence of rabbinism lapsed and desiccated like husk from which the corn had been taken. These heathen cults were lapsing and had developed fungoid abominations which had to be removed, but the stock was still so vital that with discretion new grafts could be inserted that would grow and, to use a favourite figure of Harnack's, serve as capillary tubes in which the sap of the new religious life could rise high, quickly, and copiously. On the whole there was probably more continuity than rupture or contrast, so that the new faith seemed to be the natural goal of the evolution of old ones. Thus, in the Christian prayers, meditation, rites, and struggles for salvation, the best of the old heathenism still lives. The view which underlay all its forms was that atonement comes by the vicarious sacrifice of the god of the gens, and Paul's self-immolating Christ is no mere effigy or unwilling captive or criminal, nor an intangible phantom, nor a metaphysical Platonic idea, but a symbol of the human race, and so his death and Resurrection are not so much an historical story as an eternal allegory. Wrede even suggests that had Paul had personal knowledge of Jesus this would have been something of an obstacle to his apotheosis of him, and that had the Pauline epistles come first in the New Testament, as they were first in time, perhaps we could hardly have regarded Jesus as a real man but rather as an ideal bearer of all the great attributes or a composite portrait of all the great functions with which previous religions had invested their supreme ideals. There were other preformations, e. g., dreams of a golden age, expectations of a great deliverer, deep longing for post-mortem personal life. Some or most of these were common throughout the realm conquered by Alexander and later by Rome, and wherever they occurred the spread of Christianity was facilitated, while where they were unknown or dim it found barriers hard to pass, as, e. g., into the domain of Brahminism, Confucianism, and even in the Teutonic domain.

Finally, looking back, let us ask ourselves what really happened during the first forty days, few months, or very first few years, after Jesus' death, that made this point the greatest era in the world's history. We can answer comprehensively that it was an unprecedented exaltation and fusion of the best ideals of humanity. The phylon "took up the harp of life and smote on all the chords with might; smote the chord of self, which, trembling, passed in music out of sight," so that the race and its interests came nearer than ever before or since to incar-

nation in the individual. The future dominated the present, and inner states were so intensified that outer states sank to relative insignificance and moral purity became a passion. This, in rough terms, was what was happening, and there was nothing else save what is connoted and denoted in these phrases. It was all natural and all explicable by the unique conjunction of events, and there were no unknown psychological laws. It was the sudden advent of man's adolescence with its characteristic outburst of accelerated growth, its penetrating insights, foregleams of all the soul will ever know, its realizations, its waves of altruism when the race takes possession of the individual, endowing him with all his rich heritage of enthusiasm, energy, and intuition which it is henceforth his whole duty to conserve, refine, and apply. So now Gospels had soon to be written, and myths, miracles, epistles, rites, institutions, grew, born of the effort to preserve, objectify, organize, and put to work the wealth of new powers so lavishly poured out. The new psychic energies set free were given by an inveterate instinct a Uranian or astral direction. A filial relation was evolved between the new consciousness and the source of all things, personified as a celestial All-Father. Closer social bonds even than those of classic friendship were developed, and had to be provided for. Some of the new *aperçus* found fit embodiment in a common and very portative *muthos* till later, born of the needs of controversy and combined as it had to be with the cumulative wealth of religious experiences, a *credo* arose which is the germ of theology. Methods of attaining and retaining higher inner states had to be wrought out, as did modes of demarcating those who had from those who had not attained, or who opposed it. Access to this higher life must be opened to all men, etc. The prime trait of early Christianity was thus a great tide of new joy in life that lifted everything within its pale to a higher level. New words, even, or old ones charged with new meanings came into vogue—grace, charity, love, hope, faith, the Holy Spirit and its fruits, repentance, forgiveness, turning from death to life, putting on Christ and also having him born within; for new experiences had to have new phrases.

But it was impossible to objectify or realize all that had occurred and been dimly sensed, and hence all who had experienced the great augmentation of efficiency and the transformations it involved believed that behind and above all they knew were countless higher unseen spiritual agencies, so that another of the chief characteristics of this age

was its intense pneumaticism.[1] This meant that every inner calenture was inspired and regarded as the work of some invisible power or spirit, and inspiration was possession. Strong and inexplicable impulses were interpreted, not as an exaltation of the natural powers of man, as we know them to be, but as supernatural, and thus divine or mysteries, gifts of the Holy Spirit received by faith. Weinel says that what might be called inspirational *séances* were held till well on into the second century, strange as they seem to outsiders. The Holy Ghost was communicated to neophytes by laying on of hands, and prayer, and wrought signs and wonders. The apostolate was its chief gift, and it might be continuous, as with its members, or intermittent, and had many degrees. Instead of being one spirit, it was often conceived as differentiated into many. It gave visions, wisdom, sleep, heroism. Philo said: "When the divine insanity or prophetic impulse comes over man the sun of consciousness must set and the human must vanish in the divine light." Ecstasy for him was the essential form of prophecy; but every wise and virtuous man could speak not his own mind, but utter what was given to him as will-lessly as the strings of an instrument. Indeed, for decades, most great thoughts or strong feelings that came suddenly were thought to be given by some of these muses. These pneumatophores soon had to distinguish between good and bad spirits, for unclean demons might possess the soul. The Spirit seized, bound, cried out, drove into the desert, inspired means to overthrow Satan's work; and the unpardonable sin was to mistake the work of a true spirit for that of a demon. The former worked miracles, was comparable to the wind, its visitations were like those of angels, made of fire and light. In this immaterial world dwell the souls of the dead, and this made the whole of the latter part of the first and second centuries eschatological. The old aeon was dead, and another had come. Had spiritism been too intensely cultivated, historicity would have been lost; but this in time was duly subordinated. Paul's anthropology made his pneumaticism unique. His conversion, his claim to speak with tongues more than they all, his type of preaching, his calling as an extra apostle, his groaning, sighing, crying "Abba, Father," witnessed to his possession of this heavenly treasure. It welled up from within, bestowing charismata

[1]See Weinel: "Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter, bis auf Irenäus." Leipzig, 1899, 234 p. H. Gunkel: "Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes." 2d ed. Göttingen 1899, 109 p. Karl Holl: "Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum; eine Studie zu Symeon dem neuen Theologen." 1898, 332 p. Wendt: "Teaching of Jesus." 1901, 2 vol. Harnack: "Monasticism: its Ideals and History," and the "Confessions of St. Augustine." London, 1901, 171 p.

of many kinds and degrees. Sometimes it interpreted senseless utterances. It inspired every virtue. Power and spirit were for Paul synonymous. It was God's strength and will, and also the procreative power of the heavenly Father, to beget earthly children. It made man not only a new being, but dead to the world with which he must make a break. Although supernatural and sporadic, it had its own laws, and its possession marked an advance over the prophets. It was not based on speculation, like the wisdom literature of the Hebrews, but was more theosophic. Paul's life was a riddle to him which he sought to explain by his pneuma, which was the ideal possession of eternal life. For him there was at least partial identity between it and Christ, although the efficiency of the latter was greater. One of its attributes was that it was whole, or holy, as opposed to sin or disease, and its freedom was autonomous, and no power on earth could constrain it. His experience is a fresh well-spring of the inner life, and its psychological content should be the basis of theology, which like religious institutions, is one of its deposits. These newer studies of religious enthusiasm made the attitude toward spirits, in Weinel's phrase, "the most essential possession of the innermost personal life of primitive Christendom." Here we must include apparitions, demons, angels, for the multifarious spiritism was widespread and intense. The invisible world of powers, principalities, heathen gods, was long a dominant influence, and is a new key to the history of this period. Evil spirits were arrayed under the leadership of Satan, and caused countless heresies and the desolating effects of the persecutions were ascribed to them. They manifested themselves in hysterical, epileptic symptoms, heathen magic, spurious miracles; and not only men, but even animals, were inspired by them to war on mankind. Pagan rites were sacrifices to devils whose purpose it was to seduce to polytheism and idolatry, and there was great joy when one Christian was led astray. Dread of these influences became a superstitious awe that darkened life and gave it a sombre background. War, murder, adultery, sacrilege, were inspirations of Satan and his ministers. He sent doubt, pain, hate, that made the Christian life a desperate battle and made asceticism necessary. These mighty invisible personal powers behind the world were well organized, and Olympian Jove, the Roman emperor, and all false gods were their representatives. Christ, on the other hand, inspired faith that none of these principalities or any other creature could

separate the believer from his Master. Thus, good and evil powers were leagued and graded, with the Holy Spirit supreme among the powers of good, pouring out love and giving assurance that the legions of Satan would be driven back to the pit. This exuberance of enthusiasm, which was interpreted as a pouring out of the Spirit, had at first to be checked for the work of organization. But it gave the inner witness; transformed life; marked the beginning of life in heaven. Its effects were not only speaking in unknown tongues which were often interpreted, poetizing, narrating words heard in trancoidal states or autosuggestions that came in meditation, but inspiring authorship sometimes without comprehension, by direct impartation. Cures were wrought; demons confessed its power. In the field of will it brought both tonic and clonic cramps, and involuntary and sometimes uncoördinated movements. The behest of the Spirit prompted symbolic acts, heroic renunciation of possessions, fasting, continence, obedience, service, all supernaturally motivated. Thus, back of the phenomenal world were two camps of hostile spirit forces arrayed against each other. Virtue was the work of the one, and vice that of the other. Things were heard without understanding. There were floods of light. Some had clairvoyance and what might now seem telepathy. The senses were affected, and in apocalyptic moments the dramatic state brought what seemed oblivion to the outer world. Never has there been such richness and variety of pneumatic life as in this age, which Zeller thinks in the West was more superstitious than any other before or since. All this showed that, for generations, the souls of men were in a state of high tension; and the marvel is that these states of supercharged mental energy often went with the greatest practical sagacity.

The great inaugural work of the Holy Ghost was to create belief in the risen Jesus; but more than this, the risen Jesus was himself its creation. In giving realization to this deep unconscious wish-suggestion in the soul of his followers it not only worthily inaugurated but virtually completed its work. All the above rank growths of spiritism that followed were involved in this prime act of faith and were the *Vorfrucht* of the rich virgin soil in the first stages of reclamation from the miasmatic marsh of superstition, from which the long succession of crops of idealisms has since grown. Now the pneuma was related to the psyche, much as Platonism thought the psyche was to the soma.

The charismata that flowed from the new dispensation of the Spirit which was the pleroma of them all were only corollaries of full belief in the Resurrection. When it was once accepted, all the rest followed. This gave a new futuristic trend, for the centre of all human interests was henceforth less on what was or is than on what was about to be, and the wild eschatology of that day was only a rude attempt to express in figurate imagery this new trend. With his soul really back in the world, identified, believed in, and marching on, as captain of the souls of all his followers, the goal of all Jesus' endeavour was attained, his work was finished, his legitimate successor installed, and he and his career were henceforth only a memory, sacred and enshrined. Like other great leaders, all that was human of him sleeps forever, and only his spirit henceforth wakes and lives. It does so only in those souls that experience supernormal reinforcement or are inspired by the larger soul of the race, impelling them to new and upward steps in the evolution of an ever-higher manhood in an ever-better kingdom of man. What Seelye called "the enthusiasm of humanity," Giddings, "the sense of kind," analysis dubs "ethical erethism" and, in general, the higher potentialization in the individual, and in communities, of the power that makes for righteousness, that toward the future gives augmented optimism for the good and a deeper pessimism for the bad, reinforced now by new eugenic insights—these together constitute the legacy of Jesus and indicate the most generic gifts of the Spirit. Such phrases indicate the rough shadow plan of the higher story which Jesus built in the mansion of Mansoul.[1]

[1]See A. Schweitzer: "Paul and His Interpreters." London, 1912, 268 p. O. Pfleiderer: "Lectures on the Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity." Trans. by J. F. Smith. 3d ed., London, 1897, 292 p. For a handy but uncritical sketch, see E. D. Wood: "The Life and Ministry of Paul the Apostle." Boston, 1912, 261 p. See also J. C. Geikie: "The Gospels." London, 1894, 520 p.; A. C. McGiffert: "A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age." New York, 1903, 681 p.; H. B. Carré: "Paul's Doctrine of Redemption." New York, 1914, 175 p.; James Orr: "Problem of the Old Testament." New York, 1906, 562 p.; H. B. Swete: "Appearances of Our Lord after the Passion." New York, 1908. Paul Carus: "The Pleroma." Chicago, 1909, 163 p.; B. Weiss: "Paulus und seine Gemeinde." 1914, 296 p.; C. Clemen: "Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des neuen Testaments." Giessen, 1909, 301 p.; S. G. Ayres: "Jesus Christ Our Lord:" an English bibliography of Christology comprising over five thousand titles annotated and classified. New York, 1906, 502 p.; W. Hanna: "The Forty Days After Our Lord's Resurrection." 1866, 163 p. See also Segaloff: "Die biologische Bedeutung der Ekstase, Zeits. f. Psychotherapie u. medizinische Psychologie." See also my "Human Efficiency," address at Clark College, 1909; G. E. Partridge: "Psychology of Second Breath," *Ped. Sem.*, Vol. 4, No. 3; also his "Psychology of Intemperance"; G. T. Patrick: "Psychology of Relaxation"; Mantegazza: "Die Ekstasen des Menschen"; F. M. Davenport: "Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals"; A. Lang: "Myth, Ritual and Religion"; W. James: "Varieties of Religious Experience"; Bourke: "Snake Dance of the Moquis"; Bauman, Hauptmann, H. A. Kennedy: "St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things." 1904, 390 p.; L. A. Muirhead: "The Eschatology of Jesus." 1904, 224 p.; G. B. Stevens: "The Pauline Theology." 1908, 383 p.; W. D. Hyde: "From Epicurus to Christ." 1905, 285 p.

I have been also indebted to J. H. Holtzmann: "Das messianische Bewusstsein Jesu." Tübingen, 1907, 100 p.; A. Pott: "Das Hoffen im Neuen Testament." Leipzig, 1915, 203 p.; D. E. Haupt: "Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu in den synoptischen Evangelien." Berlin, 1895, 167 p.; A. Kalthoff: "Die Entstehung des Christentums." Leipzig, 1904, 155 p.; M. Brückner: "Die Enstehung der paulinischen Christologie." Strassburg, 1903, 237 p.; D. B. Weiss: "Die Religion des Neuen Testaments." Stuttgart, 1903, 321 p.; G. H. MacNish: "The Master of Evolution." Boston, 1911, 135 p.; C. A. Briggs: "The Messiah of the Gospels." New York, 1894, 337 p.; A. P. Stokes: "What Jesus Christ Thought of Himself." New York, 1916, 114 p.; C. A. Dinsmore: "Atonement in Literature and Life." 1906, 250 p.; C. F. Kent: "The Work and Teaching of the Apostles." 1915, 313 p.; G. H. Gilbert: "The First Interpreters of Jesus." 1901, 729 p.; O. Pfleiderer: "Primitive Christianity." 2 vols, 1911; W. H. Thurton: "The Truth of the Gospels." 1913, 639 p.; F. Andres: "Die Engellehre."1914, 183 p.; G. Denny: "Jesus and the Gospels." 1908, 418 p.

CHAPTER EIGHT

JESUS' ETHICS AND PRAYER

I. Gist of the moral teachings of the sermon on the mount—Subordination of the individual to the whole among unicellular organisms, also the bee and the ant—Animal herds—Primitive totemic society—Altruism and mutual help—The ethics of self-subordination—Interpretations of totemism, its influence in shaping the doctrines and life of early Christendom—The contrast between the hyperindividual or superman and the opposite of social subordination and effacement—Jesus' attitude to science and its explanation—II. The evolution of prayer among primitive people—Its types, forms, and meanings—Its place in the world of science—Its incalculable psychological and pedagogical influence—Its specific functions, especially that of confession in the new light which psychology has shed upon it—An exposition of the Lord's Prayer in the light of modern thought.

THE so-called sermon on the mount embodies the most essential teachings of Jesus. The first and strongest impression it makes upon every candid mind is that it challenges in the most flagrant way most of the principles on which modern Occidental man conducts his life. The beatitudes are upon the poor in spirit, the meek, the mourners, those who are persecuted and reviled. They are to inherit heaven and earth along with the pure in heart, those who hunger for righteousness, the merciful, and the peacemakers. These are the salt and light of the world.

Then come the great inwardizations. To feel anger is murder; to feel lust, adultery. If any member or function offend, get rid of it, even if that involve mutilation. Sacrifice is giving up rancour. Simple assent and dissent are sufficient, with no oaths or protestations. Hardest of all is the precept, "resist not evil; turn the other cheek to the smiter; if you are robbed, give the robber more; love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate and persecute you." Give alms, pray and fast, not in public but secretly. Seek no other but heavenly treasure; serve God wholly; take no more thought

concerning food than do the birds, or concerning clothes than do the lilies; think not of the morrow. Ask and you will receive all that is good for you. Pronounce no judgments upon others. Do to others as you wish them to do to you. Those who practise these precepts build not upon the shifting sands but upon the Rock of Ages.

Surely, even to attempt seriously to live according to such prescriptions, one must become an ascetic or a monk and devote his whole life to self-regimentation. In a world of such individuals there would be little industrial wealth, ambition, enterprise, feasting, amusement, fashion, rivalry, or competition. There would be no wars, or even conflicts, no personal foresight, no penalties, no pride of station, and no knowledge or lust of power. Evil would remain unresisted, and there would be no toil or worry for a livelihood. Even Oriental communities that have taken these precepts in earnest and tried to live up to them have almost always come to grief. No wonder that such ideals have been sometimes derided as a fool's paradise by enemies, on the one hand, or on the other have been characterized in every kind of mitigating, accommodating, and euphemistic way by friends. Still, if we are honest, we cannot escape the bald fact that it is exactly in these precepts that we have the core of Jesus' teaching, and that he meant them to be taken literally. Moreover, the more we study the above items, the more we realize that they are not isolated, so that we can pick and choose, accepting some and rejecting others; but they form a pretty complete psychological and ethical whole, so that if we abate the rigour of one, that of the others suffers. The injunction to resist not evil, e. g., was the only thing in the sermon on the mount which Wu Ting Fang seriously challenged, but Tolstoi made it the key to everything in Christianity.

Are these ideals good, true, or even beautiful? Are they practical? The best point of view from which to answer these questions we shall find by a glance at the early evolutionary stages of social development.

Once unicellular organisms were the highest forms of life. Each individual performed all the fundamental vital functions of self-preservation, food-getting, and reproduction. When multicellular organisms arose, each cell surrendered progressively some of its functions, and developed and specialized others in the interests of the whole and with great gain. The higher organisms thus evolved proved to have many advantages in the struggle for existence. The integration

and differentiation of the constituent units which thus occurred involved more or less limitation and subordination of each part to the whole. Even where colonies of protozoa arose, the same advance occurred in greater or less degree as Espinas was the first to show in a broad way. Indeed, every metazoan body is a colony of cells. A swarm of bees or a nest of ants might be called a body in which each unit while acting within the plan of the whole, is detached enough to have its own freedom of movement. The worker bee[1] often works itself to death in two or three months for the sake of the hive. In the ant state the individual is no less subordinated to the welfare of the community. Each class and each individual has its own functions in conserving and developing the community, which lives on for generations with a kind of terrestrial immortality, while countless generations of individuals wear themselves out in serving it. Thus to each cell in a body, and to each member of such an insect community, the precepts of Jesus concerning abandonment of personal ends for the good of the whole would hold; for each individual is only a means to an end vaster than itself.

In the social organization of higher forms of animal life gregariousness has immense advantages over solitary habits, as we see in the familiar comparisons between the cat and the dog, which are vastly to the advantage of the latter because it is far more completely domesticated, more intelligent, docile, etc. Man is probably the most gregarious of all mammals, and to this fact he owes, in no small part, not only his survival but his dominion over the animal world. Thus his social nature means that even his primary egoistic impulsions for food and sex, and also his fear, anger, lust for power and possessions, etc., are constantly restrained in the interests of the clan, tribe, or group to which he belongs, which always demands altruism. The repressions thus arising from his social *milieu* have operated from the very first, and probably even before he became man, and their influence is powerful. They are also all-pervading and their ramifications are met in every department of life. The herd instinct is far more dominant than one would infer from the psychology of crowds, or even that of suggestion. It may be mainly offensive as is illustrated by the wolf-pack, or chiefly defensive, as in a flock of sheep. Group influences

[1] See Maeterlinck: "The Life of the Bee"; also especially W. Trotter: "The Instinct of the Herd in Peace and War." 1915, 212 p.

incessantly check, facilitate, transform, man's every impulse. They make society, from the clan up, more or less homogeneous. It is due to them that each unit is so extremely sensitive to the conduct and sentiment of each other member of his group, as well as of the whole, as we see all the way from the first symbiosis up to the development of the higher form of sympathy. To break from group control, custom, action, or opinion, involves a painful conflict. Suggestion and even speech itself are media of the union of each with all. Much that we call reason is only an attempt to justify our instinctive acquiescence in the mandates of society; and a large part of human conduct, and most of what we call morals, and even religion, consists essentially of group prescriptions, so that about all sin is defiance of social control, and insistence upon our personal uninhibited individual wishes and desires. Whenever we do thus break away from what the general consensus of our social *milieu* requires we have a painful sense of unworthiness, ill-desert, imperfection, insufficiency; in a word, of sin or guilt. The Pauline war within our members began with the very first inclination to violate tribal taboo.

As human society has grown complex, and family, clan, community, and man's social *rapport* have irradiated, and have also broken up into industrial, cultural, and other groups within groups, the adjustment between egocentric inclinations and social requirements has become very complex and very difficult. Conflicts are innumerable. They are incessant and painful, and men often break away from the law of service to the whole. Thus, man is not so adjusted to his human as the bee is to its community. That he should become no less so is the postulate of Jesus. Only when this adjustment is made will man be an ideal *socius* in an ideal kingdom. To effect a complete adaptation between them both, society and the individual must change. But the change can and must begin with the individual. The bee and ant state began to evolve countless ages before man appeared, so that besides being simpler themselves and living in a simpler state, they have had a vastly longer time to develop their communities. Both the human individual and his society are vastly more complex. Moreover, man has been very seriously aberrant and has suffered loss or arrest. Storms of passion and many departures from his norm have left their scars upon his nature. It may well be doubted, too, whether modern institutions control the individuals within them to-day as

completely as was the case in the ancient tribe. From the point of view of the sermon on the mount, man seems to have just begun to effectively socialize himself, old as are his efforts and deep as is his instinct to do so. In some respects conventions are too rigid, and prevent what Walt Whitman and Carpenter call "free exfoliation" of the individual without danger of disruption of the social bond, and thus, too, great resistance to progress and free differentiation arises. Here social pressure is too great, there too weak, or man is too insensitive to it. Jesus had little place for great men or hero-worship in the Kingdom as he conceived it. But his blessings are upon the simple life, and his praises are for simple duties in a simple environment. History is essentially the story of man's efforts to find his place in nature, and especially his true relations to his fellow men; and both endeavours, especially the latter, are now in their rudimentary stages. When this work is finished, we may perhaps then realize the ethics of Jesus, and the hyperindividuation of to-day may be reduced to the dimensions most favourable for the interests of the race, to serve which is the whole of both duty and piety.

Not only Jesus' person as Messiah, the atonement achieved by his death, his mystic union with the Father and his followers, according to Pauline and Johannin doctrines (as characterized in other chapters of this book), but the ethics of self-subordination taught in his "Sermon" are all standing forth in a new light by reason of the manifold studies of what it is now apparent was the chief culture system of uncounted prehistoric millennia, to which we give the inadequate name of totemism. Robertson Smith first showed how totemism was the key to the secrets of the entire sacrificial cult of the Old Testament. Other studies show how it permeated the cults of ancient Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Greece, Phoenicia, Mexico, and Peru, to say nothing of the entire social organism of many primitive peoples. When we ask what it was, and especially how it arose, expert opinions are hopelessly divergent.

Frazer, after long and perplexing investigations, thought he had found a solution among the Arunta.[1] Mothers at first did not know, and later feigned ignorance of, the cause of conception. When a mother felt the first movements of a child in her body attention may

[1] "Totemism and Exogamy." Edinburgh, 1887. Especially p. 96. See also "The Beginnings of Religion and Totemism Among the Australian Aborigines," *Fortnightly Review*, Sept., 1905.

have been strongly drawn to something near her, for instance, an emu or a kangaroo, which acquired thus a peculiar significance, till she fancied its soul had "struck root in her." Thus the child, when born, although it will look human will be an emu or a kangaroo in essence. The child, when later told of this paternity, loved and cultivated the species. Thus many other totems would be found by others. In this "conception theory" Frazer said, "our plummet has at last touched bottom," although he has later abandoned this view in despair. Totemism often, as here, included the idea of ancestral spirits, perhaps connected with amulets archaically marked, and so discarnate spirits of older days may be reborn. On the other hand, of 201 totems in Central Australia, 169 are of edible animals. Ten years later F. Max Müller[1] sought to discredit totemism by calling it an infantile epidemic of thought, refusing to credit the totemic origin even of Egyptian thierolatry, totemism being inconsistent with his theory of a more primitive and direct worship of natural objects, and holding that animals and other fetishes of savages were eponymous ancestors.

W. Robertson Smith[2] reduces the most essential part of the Old Testament cult of Yahveh to totemism, which was also the core of the ceremony of the feast of the dead. An offering on an altar or a *sacrificium* was the essential rite in about all religions, and was "an act of social fellowship between the deity and his worshippers," or a communion of the faithful with their god. The oldest offerings were animals, and others came later and were progressively dematerialized—flesh, blood, then smoke or incense. The significance of common eating was always to strengthen the social bond; for the god was commensal with his worshippers, and eating the same food meant the same material of their body. In this act the worshipper says to his god, "You are my blood and flesh." As men are consubstantial with their mother through her milk, so food is a family bond. There was no communion without the sacrifice of an animal, and this must always be public; for no one could slay even a domestic animal for his own use. The common blood of the tribe is sacred, and the sacrificial animal was treated like a relative, so that the god, the animal, and the tribe were one, not unlike the persons of the Trinity. Thus the animal offered up became a totem. The sacrificial animal was holy to the god, and originally

[1] "Contributions to the Science of Mythology." London, 1897. Especially pp. 7, 158, and 443.
[2] "The Religion of the Semites." New York, 1889, 488 p.

identical with the god. All animals were once sacred, and no flesh could be eaten unless the whole tribe participated in so doing, for to slaughter an animal was to pour out tribal blood. On this basis developed in many lands the idea that atonement was necessary for the slaughterer in this sacrifice, which was the tie that binds the members of the race each to each, and each to his god, and each to the totemic animal, the life of which must not be touched unless the entire tribe was guilty. Thus the totem animal was the primitive god, slaying and eating of which brought the closest communion. The Aztec human offerings, the bear offerings of the bear tribe, also the Ianos, the tortoise offerings among the Zunis, illustrate this "killing the divine animal and eating the god."

Durkheim[1] regards the totem as almost a god, dwelling in each member of the group and all of them in it. It is not only the condition of the existence of the group, but soul of its soul and life of its life. It is also the clan ancestor immanent in it, and incarnate in each individual, perhaps his very blood itself. It is the chief object of the cult of a tribe, and the focus of its religion. Each totem, therefore, is in a sense divine, and if its blood is shed its very being is poured out. Thus the totem is consanguineous and consubstantial in each in whom it dwells, and is the central part of his personality. It can no more be changed than can his soul. It is a principle of filiation. So intussuscepted are the members of a totem tribe or phratry that it becomes incestuous for them to marry; hence, exogamy. Animals of the same species as the totem are usually tabooed, for to eat them would be cannibalism. If half of a horde chose a separate animal deity, the horde would then split into two clans which might become hostile, but members of the one clan can now intermarry with those of the other by capture or purchase. Back of this strange biological metaphysics of totemism Durkheim assumes an aboriginal religiosity or a feeling of something potent, dreadful, supernal (as Mana principle), which in process of time became attached more to certain animals or persons than to others, perhaps originally more often to women, whose motherhood is mystically regarded. This divine principle, therefore, was a diffusive power that came to concentrate itself in the emu, bear, etc., which then became a sacred shrine of the divinity and gave the name of the animal to the tribe. He assumes that the sexual

[1]Various articles in *L'Année Sociologique* since 1898.

relation was first more or less promiscuous, and that thus arose the first attempts to regulate it. The totemic animal is neither exactly the species nor the Platonic idea of it. It is an individual but mythical being from whom all members of the group evolved, so that once within it existed potentially both the human clan and the animal species, both being thus close blood relations. Totemism is thus usually closely connected with the segregation of tribes into primitive matrimonial classes. Durkheim does not attempt to suggest the time which it took totemism to evolve, but J. F. Hewitt[1] in discussing the development of the mythology of India, which he thinks was made by projecting more or less important events rather than individuals in very highly symbolic form upon the heavens, wherein if we only had the cipher we could read in the ancient astrological creatures there the history of man, believes we must go back definitely to about 21,000 years B. C. and that this period continued down to, and indeed well into, the historic period. As perpetuated guide-marks of the progress of tribes, with events apotheosized in the very names of the constellations (at first animal), these official transmitters gave us in pictorial language the story of their achievements laid off in superposed layers, which added greatly to man's interest in the heavens and still reverberates with the momentum of millennia in the soul. Thus heavenly things acquired a new interest till they were superseded by a later race that took a more economic view of stellar phenomena. Many believe that, at least in these fields, we have sketchy outlines or remnants of the history of man long before there is any other record, that here lies the philosophy of the paleo- and neo-lithic ages before domestication of animals, and that we glimpse here old methods of thought laboriously wrought out which already gave man mental unity and a basis of association, brought economy in thinking, together with communal solidarity, and, especially, laid the foundations for religion.

Lang[2] takes a very different view. Agreeing with Darwin that primitive man must have lived in very small and highly gregarious communal groups, so small, indeed, that male jealousy on the part of the head of the clan would be a constant repellant force (especially since man is amatory at all seasons), he thinks that these early groups of men came to assume the names of certain animals and other objects

[1] "History and Chronology of the Myth-Making Age." London, 1901. Also "The Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times in India," etc. London, 1894.

[2] "The Secret of the Totem." London, 1905, 215 p.

and thus to feel themselves in closer *rapport* with them, and to develop a general magic for the species thus constituted of which they were a part. Hewitt had thought that the animal name began the entire process, and would be thought to imply a mystic connection. The name was thus the soul-bearer or box. Hence, the totem became the group-soul designating the most vital part, and all individuals bearing that name were psychically one. Pikler and Somló[1] thought that one of the first needs of man was settled names for his communities, which could be expressed in pictographs, tattoos, on grave-posts, etc., as a clan mark, and the advantage of animal names was that they could be better expressed in picture language. On this view, therefore, the name is the germ of totemism. Once the relation between all objects and their names was everywhere deemed vital. On this view totemism took its rise rather in the practical needs of man than in his religious instincts. To utter names, or even to know them, gave enemies or lovers power over those who bore them. Hence, true names were often secret, and perhaps in proportion as the generic name became recognized and accepted by those bearing it, it could be used to harm or help an entire group. Later, when the connection between the totem name and what it designated was settled, man's active speculative mind began to evolve myths as to the connection between itself and its name-giving totem, and this solidarity often became quite as great as that between mother and child. The bond of union was blood. Later, but on this basis, came the various taboos pertaining to the particular animal, and also to marriage. Sometimes even contact with the totem means disrespect for its palladial quality. Savages never know the origin of these transcendentally binding names, because it is always obscured by traditions of later origin. Lang thinks they may have arisen as sobriquets or nicknames given by one group to another, sometimes perhaps opprobrious at first, even though later adopted. Thus, to receive the name of an animal in the savage mind came to mean "to be endowed with the essence or spirit of the object or to be under its protection, to become one with it in a very special and unique sense." The epithet may have been suggested by some resemblance of feature or trait, although Hewitt thinks that dreams of seers or medicine men may have given a sense of relationship to some specific animal. The totem name became the centre of a religious

[1] "Der Ursprung des Totemismus." Berlin, 1900, 36 p.

system involving praying to, feeding, or burying the totem, best seen in Samoa where the totem was regarded as the shrine of an ancestral spirit. In Egypt the animal gods were once totems, and some of them were even creators. Menzies[1] says roundly, "there is no animal that has not once been worshipped," and he thinks that in Babylonia we have the earliest clear records of the transition from zoölatry to anthropolatry in its winged bulls and eagle-headed men. Occasionally we find an "over-all deity" having a totemic name for every part of his body, and some deities create man out of a certain animal or a primal creature rising out of the ground or sea, or he comes from the sky, or is transformed perhaps after death into the first man. Frazer collects very many reincarnation myths of this kind. In one case the name is ascribed to the fact that the gens had lived so long on the flesh of a particular animal which had become its totem that its qualities had passed into the eaters. Haddon[2] found that in the Torres Straits the disposition of the clan members was supposed to reflect the character of the totem; that the animal was often extinct, even where it was revered and protected, indicating the very great age of the institution. He described elaborate initiation rites, and found other indications here of the advance along the line which the race must have taken from the worship of a great animal to that of a great man. Among the Malays, who were highly totemic, he often found personal totems cultivated, which had been suggested either by dreams or by some exceptional experience.

The totemic theories of American anthropologists, based largely upon the Indians of the North-west who are less primitive than Australians, show that the very word totem has many (Powell says from ten to fourteen) different meanings. Hill-Tout thinks it may mean either a sacred animal, a tribe, the name of a religious or magic society or object, an hereditary designation of kin, or even an individual. The protective animal, guardian spirit, or patron, Powell thinks, always comes from the Manitou or from some person to whom the animal or object was revealed by an inspired dream or vision, or else is the result of a long fast, or of hypnotic suggestion during initiation to adolescence. If the totem kins become exogamous, he thinks it is later and by treaty. The essence of totemism here is the spiritual entity.

[1] "History of Religion." London, 1895, p. 30.
[2] "Head-hunters." London, 1901. Especially Chapter 9.

Boas thinks that crests or totem marks perhaps once designated a tutelary spirit or genius. There is certainly vast difference between the American Indians and the Pacific Islanders in this respect. Instead of being hereditary, the American totem is often acquired in pubescent trance. Occasionally there are myths of metamorphosis into totemic animals or approximation of each to the habits of the other, with some suggestion of metempsychosis.

Some believe that in the old animal epos we have some vestiges of totemism. For instance the story of Reynard the Fox,[1] the most famous of the best cycles or epics, gives characteristic names as well as traits which were recognized all over Europe, as Noble, the lion; Bellin, the lamb; Bruin, the bear; Baldwin, the ass; Eisengrim, the wolf; Chanticleer, the cock, etc., where each animal represents a human trait personified. The origin of the story of Reynard is still a mystery. No one knows whether it was Oriental or possibly astrological. It certainly represents a different psychic attitude toward animals from that represented by Æsop, and still more by Uncle Remus. Zabism, too, or serpent worship and the art of snake charmers are of undoubted totemic origin.[2]

Freud[3] finds the key to totemism in the child's relation to animals. Children often have an *Angsttier* or an animal which has come to be especially dreaded and in which they therefore have a special interest. Occasionally they imitate and almost personate, as well as dread, this animal. Accidents of the individual's experience usually determine what animal it is, but Freud holds that this attitude was first developed toward the child's father and later transferred from him to the animal, which may be loved as well as hated at the same time, or alternately. The animal may appear in a recurrent dream, as in *pavor nocturnus*, as savages sometimes find their totem. A boy of five very carefully analyzed had such a phobia for a horse, which was found to be part of an "Oedipus complex" carried over from the father to the horse, which thereby became the boy's totem. Wulff found the same transfer from the father to a dog in a boy of nine, and Ferenczi describes another to all kinds of waterfowl. Toward such animals children very often feel a strong ambivalent hate and love. Hence Freud infers

[1] See Caxton: "History of Reynard the Fox." 1481. Also Jacobs: "The Most Delectable History of Reynard the Fox." London, 1895. Also Goethe's poetical version in Dale's edition, Vol. 2.

[2] See W. H. D. Adams: "Curiosities of Superstition." London, 1882. Chapter 2.

[3] "Totem und Tabu." 1913, 149 p.

that the totemic animal is really the father, particularly the father of the clan, who was a severe disciplinarian, enforced exogamy, etc. The two commands of the totem are that the animal representing it must not be killed, and that no woman inside the clan can be married. Both these commands Oedipus broke. After the totem is slain the attitude toward him is reversed and he is revered as is the father in primitive parricide. Thus totemism developed from the father-surrogate and from a sense of filial guilt, and every totem and every god were fashioned on the pattern of the father.

In our day of hypertrophied individuation, egoism, and perhaps Teutonic ideas of the superman, it is not strange that Reinach thinks totemism a hypertrophy of its opposite, viz., the social instinct. But the more we understand this central problem of prehistoric culture, the more we realize that in primitive communities the individual was hardly less subordinated to the group than in the hive or the formicary. Its members were one by closer bonds than those of classic friendship as characterized by Aristotle and Cicero before romantic love for the other sex, as Finck describes it, arose. It bound fellow tribesmen into a unity no whit less deep and mystic, and in some respects more so, than that described in modern amatory literature. Members of a totem were one in having the name often sacredly secret, at a time, too, when the name was no mere nominalistic *flatus vocis* but almost an entity, giving those who used it conjuring power over those to whom it was applied. They were one by partaking of a common meal, eating commensally the same divine animal, and becoming thereby "milk brethren," as if born from the same mother. All who ate the flesh or drank the blood of the same god became thereby one in him as he is and remains one in them, a symbol of the sacramental tie that binds. They were one so closely and literally that to marry any clan member was incest, for she was a true sister. They were one so sacrosanctly that members could exchange their very souls, so that we have here one key to explain metamorphosis, and transmigration or metempsychosis. They were one in having a common ancestor, and the totem was often a father-surrogate; the same feelings and attitudes developed toward the father or perhaps toward the head of the clan, being transferred to the totem. They were sometimes one, too, in a special sense on great festivals and corroborees, where in states of social exaltation they partly projected their ecstatic sense of unity,

and universalized it in a sense of one pre-animistic and all-including ontological principle called variously Mana, wakanda, etc. Thus the psychic foundation was laid deep and early for man's passion both for pantheistic absorption and fusion with the universe, and also for the no-less-passionate affirmation of monotheism, and even monism; for all have here the same psychogenic root, viz., the feeling of one soul in different bodies, which every great exaltation of the social instinct brings. Thus in some small, close, and primitive communities an *e pluribus unum* feeling developed in man, the gregariousness of which is without precedent, for it was so strong that it explained all other social and, perhaps, intellectual unities, which are best understood anthropomorphically as symbols of this social union.

On this view, the cardinal attitudes, *Einstellungen*, and determining tendencies of the New Testament conserve for us the best achievements of many thousand years of prehistoric culture. In this era of small communities, the members of which were indiscerptibly bound together, each to each, and which felt, acted, and thought in common, between the individuals of which altruism and mutual help had their golden age; in these social groups which were in the closest *rapport* also with animals, plants, celestial phenomena, seasonal changes, and nature generally, were laid the foundations of all religions. In the maxims of subordination of self to the service of the group Christianity thus conserves and refines for us the most precious legacy of the most unrecorded past, the vestiges of which are like those of a lost Atlantis. If in such a close community one individual broke the bonds and smote or robbed a tribal kinsman, to invite him to smite again or to rob more would bring the automatic social reaction that would correct the aggression, while to resent evil or aggravate enmity would tend to the disruption and ruin of the group. This was only a far greater degree of the results of such action to-day in the family, where harmony is the first law and where almost any price is not too great to pay for peace. The history and psychology of Quakerism aptly illustrate the practical efficiency of these precepts, and in Jesus' day all this was intensely reinforced by the expectation of a speedy end of the world, in view of which all personal ends sank to insignificance. We might approximate this ethical standpoint if we could consider all who wrong us as diseased, and therefore irresponsible, and to be pitied as if insane or morally defective. Moreover, yielding to those not irreclaimably

violent tends to bring about in them the countervalent sentiments of sympathy toward their victim, and thus has a palliative, if not preventive, effect. A community actuated by the self-effacing morality of Jesus would need no laws, courts, nor penalties, and is found only in primitive societies such as in some respects, as has often been pointed out, Homer describes. Again, ideal motherhood, and the less often sacred ideal, fatherhood, also commended by Aristotle, ethical culture of the Desjardins type, some text-books of morals, and some of the types of Christian socialism as it has been so voluminously and variously described of late, have kept alive at least a pale afterglow of the ethics of Jesus. We are already beginning to suspect that the sick, the defective, and dependent, and the disinherited generally, who from the eugenic point of view alone considered ought to be eliminated, really perform a great function in keeping alive the spirit of sympathy and charity, which would shrivel without them, and that not only they, but criminals, are necessary for the greatest good of the community as a whole. Now, of course, social ties are weakened by being expanded centrifugally from the small family group to ever wider and often almost cosmic dimensions, and egoism, self-assertion, and aggrandizement are the chief traits of most of the historic ages, and especially of our own.

The last very few thousand years of man's existence, which we call the historic period, are but a few minutes of the day since he began; and during much of this era we must admit that man has been pretty selfish. But it was not so of old, as we have seen; and it will not be so when he reaches his normal maturity. Psychoanalysis describes as Narcissism cases in which all the love of a child is focussed upon his own person, before affection has found its proper object in others. In some neurotics we find arrest at this stage. The patient indulges a silly vanity, seems to fall in love with his own body, which he admires, pampers, and often vents all his eroticism upon. Selfishness is moral Narcissism, and induces self-magnification and indulgence, or in a word it is a kind of moral self-abuse. Mankind is in this pubescent stage, and is afflicted with its most characteristic epidemic. Whether the race will reach ethical maturity or suffer permanent arrest, perversion, or regression, as if smitten with phyletic moral dementia præcox, is the supreme question of culture and progress. The Christian life is above all things else a life so utterly devoted to goods and

worths, and that so transcends self, that self would be freely sacrificed at any time and in any way if the interests of the whole could thus be best advanced. No man has reached his ethical majority who would not die if the real interests of the community could thus be furthered. If complete, each man is always at least a potential hero or even martyr. What would the world be without the values that have been bought at the price of death? Now even religion rarely demands this supreme test, but it does demand loyalty to truth, right, and the common weal. These often require the sacrifice of means, of comfort. They necessitate the repression of every rancour and hate; they refine fear for self into fear for others, and make us fear evil for them more than we fear it for ourselves. As I write, thousands of men are vastly increasing the risk of death or mayhem for causes they deem worth the risk. A militancy that brings life as a sacrifice ready to be offered up, if called for, calls out again a new and larger perspective and rouses deeper and more generic forces in the soul. To his own superiors the soldier must illustrate meekness and submission, and to his mates a confraternity of the sermon on the mount. But all this intensified *esprit de corps* makes him more terrible to his enemies. Among those who stay at home, too, all barriers of rank, station, wealth, party, and often blood are broken, and a new solidarity supervenes, while toward the enemy racial hates are augmented and new ones developed. Thus there is regression as between the larger units and toward ancient tribal relations of hostility. Within the national units, the Kingdom of Christ; without, that of Antichrist, is advanced. Within, all aversions are reduced; without, they are intensified. There is more benevolence at home, and more malevolence abroad. At home there are more Christian forbearance, toleration, and closer bonds; and without, there are relapse toward the barbaric rules of the jungle and its hate and aggression. Meanwhile, we can only hope and pray that the good within may prove greater and more lasting than the relapse of outer relations. If only external dangers prove to confirm and advance inner harmonization, the aggregate good may exceed that of evil, and the psychic and material havoc of the conflict may be offset by gains. That we may hope for this issue we have seen many indications in the latter part of Chapter 2.

Can we infer anything concerning Jesus' attitude to culture in our sense, especially to science, the greatest achievement of modern man?

Here (and perhaps we should ask the same question concerning modern industrialism and society) we touch the greatest and sorest of all issues between Jesus' view of the world and our own. His conceptions of the cosmos were infantile and in no respect in advance of his age. Of nearly everything taught in modern universities he knew nothing, while of literature, even that of classic Greece and Rome, and of factories and modern institutions generally he does not seem to have had the slightest anticipation. Neither did he have even an inkling of the satisfaction Socrates found in response to the Delphic Oracle, which called him the wisest of men because he knew that he knew nothing.

Is there any sense in which Browning was right in saying, "Mind is nothing but disease, and natural health is ignorance?" Has man to-day so run to brain that this organ has outgrown its correlation with others, as Keridon[1] says? Has the vast luggage of knowledge that has accumulated, and that we have had to develop all the vast and complicated machinery of education to transmit, made man forget the oracles within his soul in the sense in which Plato reproached Aristotle with being a "reader" or dealer in other people's ideas instead of a creator of them at first hand? Surely Jesus looked within for his truth even more than did Plato, just as his Kingdom involved a closer cœnæsthesis between its members than did the Republic. Indeed, *fides quaerens intellectum* might be called the noetic formula of Jesus' psychic development. Moreover, in him conscience was coextensive with consciousness. Knowledge of right and wrong, good and evil, if, as Lecky and Buckle thought, the slowest, is also the most precious of all kinds of knowledge, for it is a union of knowing and doing, of *Kennen* and *Können*. The leaves on the tree of life are not, like those on the tree of knowledge, deciduous. To be completely Christian must we not assume that all knowledge that is not for the sake, not merely of action but more specifically of moral action, is sophism, and is not this indeed the trend of modern pragmatism? For Kant science was a solid island that had arisen in the midst of a vast stormy, foggy sea of nescience. Perhaps, after all, we have magnified both the extent and the importance of its domain, so that through pride we have lost the true perspective of values and needed "the Galilean peasant to

[1] "Man: the Prodigy and Freak of Nature, or, an Animal Run to Brain." The Samurai Press, Cranleigh, Surrey, 1907, 62 p.

set us right," somewhat as Tolstoi found his lost cue in the simple life of a humble worker. Must we, as Hauptmann assumed, be foolish to be Christian to-day? Has Jesus become an anachronism, a personage of now only historic importance, whom we have transcended, and can approach again only by reverting to a lower stage of development? How could he who knew so little which we deem of prime importance be called the Truth and the Light? These are the questions that have seethed in cultivated souls throughout Christendom for centuries, and still agitate the minds, especially of young students. The answer given to them by the Church without or by individual conviction within has resulted in the fact that the learned world to-day is either indifferent or hostile, or else under the obsession that some accommodation must be wrought out, however tortuous and unnatural; or, finally, in the sad fact that souls have been split into two compartments or registers, one confirming and the other forgetting or denying the authority of the Great Teacher.

One thing is certain, viz., no answer can be admitted that is based on any disparagement of science. If the alternative is science or Jesus, the latter will be sure eventually to go; but there is and can be no such alternative. Our answer is, in brief, as follows: Science began in general with inanimate, and then slowly proceeded to animate nature; and last of all, in every land where it has had a history, as, e. g., in ancient Greece, it found its consummation in the study of man. To-day sociology, anthropology, and psychology are in their infancy. The soul of man, individual and collective, is the highest, last, and most difficult of all themes (as self-knowledge is the noblest kind of knowledge), the solution of which both depends on and explains all that precedes, assigns correct values, and reveals relative importance and perspective. To this field Jesus almost solely directed his endeavours. In his conception of the Kingdom we have the results of his insights into human society; in his ideas of sin and salvation, we have his general doctrine of man; and in his character, lifework, precepts, and fate, we have the key to all the chief themes involving the moral activity of the individual. In the ways in which the soul of the race prepared for him before his advent in the older ethnic religions about the eastern Mediterranean, and in the ways in which it has reacted to it since, we have all the essentials of folk psychology. There is, of course in addition, a psychology of the senses, memory,

association, attention, etc., and there are many studies in the mechanism of psychic processes; and such work has a very significant past and will have a yet greater future development. To critical and exegetical New Testament scholarship Christology owes an inestimable debt and may possibly come to owe yet more (although many think its great work is accomplished). But the psychology that is at once dynamic, genetic, and pragmatic, and can penetrate below the shallow surface of consciousness to the unconscious depths below, finds in the great Galilean both the master craftsman in psychodynamics, and in the collective records of him the richest of all the fields for further exploration. Here he is not below but far ahead of present-day science. Here *das ewige Christliche zieht uns hinan.* He knew and compelled the individual and collective soul as no one else ever began to do. He is the centre of the greatest psychic synthesis ever yet made, and from this viewpoint as from most others, it makes vastly less difference than was till very lately thought how much of his majestic figure is historic and how much a "focus of projection of the optimal ideals of the race." Thus, if he did not know the sciences of nature he knew that of man, their maker. His psychology was not that of the schools any more than is the botany of Burbank or the physics of Edison, but like them he controlled natural agencies and brought out beneficent practical results. We can hardly assume that Jesus would not welcome all sciences that bring forth fruits or, indeed, any and every kind of knowledge that means service. In Chapter 2 we saw how many novelists and playwrights have described Jesus in various callings and situations in modern life, but no one has ever attempted yet to present him in the modern laboratory, seminary, library, or even clinic, and we rarely see his picture or image in any of these places. But this will doubtless yet come. As we have seen as a result of the war so many new conceptions of Jesus as a soldier, so a vital growing Christianity will take him wherever good men go with heart and purpose.

The evolution of *prayer* began probably with that of man himself. It is perhaps the only common trait of all religions, their very heart, and the most universal expression of piety. It is always optative or expressive of some wish, either to obtain some good or avoid some evil. It is often accompanied by rites and ceremonies, or reinforced by magic spells, or perhaps by the mimetic acts suggestive or symbolic of the desire, while the speech forms are often stereotyped, and potent

phrases or incantations.[1] "The roots of prayer are older than all creeds and cannot be deduced or derived from them." Fielding Hall thinks it inconsistent that the Buddhist women of Burma pray passionately at the shrines of their deity, because he has entered Nirvana and can neither hear nor answer. But prayer does not need to be addressed to any one, so aboriginal and primordial is "the soul's sincere desire uttered or unexpressed." Its answer, too, is subjective, its issue often being simply acquiescence, power to accept the inevitable with joy, so that if prayer is a true cause, it is so only by setting free energy within. So one can pray to malign powers or to nothing. Some think that prayer developed the gods themselves, and that their continued existence depends upon it. Among most lower races it is regarded as a kind of projection of will-power to influence a supernal being, somewhat as one influences his friends.

It is very different to-day with our vastly enlarged conceptions of the universe and of law. Compared with some of the thousands of millions of stars our sun itself is of insignificant size, and the individual on our tiny planet shrivels to a microbe, so that ideas of special providential answers can be no longer held. The child and the savage have more or less definite conceptions of whom they are addressing, but this is no longer possible, for many pray to nothing more definite than a vast diffusive power. Again, whoever or whatever is addressed is now regarded as less objective and more immanent. As Coe[2] well says, we do not conceive that the God of prayer and the God of nature are opposed or even distinct, so that the more law there is, the less God, nor do we think of a supernatural over against a natural realm. Nor are prayer and a life of piety so much split off or set apart for set hours or places, nor is the soul partitioned. Prayer is etymologically a request so that we should expect those that have most wants to be most in need of it. But the Church is more prosperous and comfortable to-day than ever before; and if these blessings are answers to prayer, then the latter tends to its own elimination, because men are more and more able to help themselves. The rich certainly do not feel the need of praying for food, shelter, clothing, as do those in adversity. In prayer man wants something done for or given him,

[1] L. R. Farnell: "The Evolution of Religion." London, 1905. R. Marett: "From Spell to Prayer." *Folklore*, 1904, Vol. 15, p. 132. D. G. Brinton: "The Religions of Primitive Peoples." New York, 1897. H. Fielding Hall: "The Hearts of Men." New York, 1901.

[2] "The Religion of a Mature Mind." New York, 1902.

and we wrestle and argue with God in many ways. We remind him (a) that he is so rich that giving does not impoverish him; (b) he is so powerful that he could help with no effort, but would need only to speak and it would be done, and he could aid us with no fatigue; (c) of the great help he has rendered others in ancient times, Abraham, Isaac, the manna and quails, etc.; (d) how wretched and mean and weak we are, prone to evil. As if we had a phobia of provoking the envy of our gods such as the Greeks feared, we indulge in patheticism, as if to excite his pity, possibly under the momentum of the old instinct of sacrifice of self; or perhaps this prayer motive, if psychoanalyzed, would be an attempt to praise God by the subtle method of contrast, or to point out to him what an opportunity our extremity is. (e) We plead promises of receiving for asking, recalling all the pledges of the old covenant, as if he might forget or not live up to his contract, or as if he had aroused great expectations which we often identify with faith. (f) We seek further to insinuate ourselves into divine favour by assurances of joy and gratitude if the largess we seek is given, so that we can feel ourselves the favourites of heaven; and our most vociferous thanksgivings are of course often subtly tinged with a lively sense of benefits to come. (g) We plead that we are loved, for he is love; that his bounty is universal for saints and sinners alike; and that he often delights to do the most for the worst. (h) We realize that a just God must be angry; that a trivial sin against infinite justice becomes itself infinite, and perhaps deserving an infinite punishment; but here we plead the alien merits of the great victim. We magnify the agony of the cross as our only plea. Its pains were sufficient to compensate for the sins of the world, and poor debtors though we are, we seek indemnity and the cancellation of penalty as beneficiaries of the great atonement fund. We argue with the Divine that instead of holding us personally responsible he set us free, and draw on the supererogatory virtue which the Great Patron has placed to our account, as if his pains could coerce mercy, and there could be no danger of overdraft. By all these categories we pray, plead, beg, urge, for health, success, prosperity, for ourselves and our friends, often with a selfishness so narrow that if our petitions were granted others would be incalculably injured. We make a virtue of an importunity that cannot be denied or put off. We would weary God out. Our hearts pant with the fervour of desire, as if heaven

hesitated and needed to be coaxed and teased. There is thus often an inordinate greed in prayer. Some prayers, of course, could not be answered, for they are contradictory or violate the order of things; and if all were answered, prayer itself would be obsolete because there would be nothing left to pray for unless for the power to conceive still greater gifts.

The Christian consciousness has rightly shrunk from any attempt to make any of the scientific tests which skeptics have proposed, especially since the day of Tyndall's prayer gauge. It properly resents any form of *experimentum crucis* to see whether of two like things under like conditions the one prayed for would have a little advantage. Perhaps the whole world as a battery of prayer with its very existence staked upon the outcome, could not make a filliped coin fall differently. Probably very few indeed of all man's prayers have in any sense been answered, because he lacks the genius to pray aright save in the most general terms. No faith can be strong enough to accomplish what is not in the nature of things, for true faith is only anticipated history. Prayer should only direct and put an edge on work, and be in the line of tendencies that are conformable to the laws of nature and of the human heart. One writer suggests that in a universe made up of spiritual beings a strong desire of any one of them would slightly influence all the others, as the earth rises to meet a falling feather; but this exiguous and infinitesimal possibility rests on a special hypothesis of the universe which will appeal to but few.

Tylor shows that prayer is almost coextensive with animism, and that perhaps all, even the lowest savages, lead lives abounding in prayer. A. J. Nutt, in "Ossian and the Ossianic Literature" (1899), says: "A nail driven into a wooden idol is a prayer, and so is a pin dropped into a sacred well." These are often selfish invocations, perhaps of their fetishes, for success in head-hunting. When we realize how man is always prone in great undertakings, in panics or in grief, to cry out for help, as if prayer were almost an automatism, even though it be a monologue or love chant, we realize how, up and down the whole scale of culture, man has always been a praying animal. Indeed, prayer has its pathology, may become a monomania or delirium, as well as worked by a machine. Criminals pray for success in crime, gamblers for lucky numbers. Prayer may be hardly more than a sob, or may lead to syncope. It may be a periodic impulse without any

muezzin or angelus. Some think its canticles based on a specific emotion or a distinct faculty. Most hymns are simply prayers. The New Caledonian kindles a fire to increase the heat of the sun which he addresses, saying, "I do this that you may be hotter." The Karens in thrashing rice call to the corn-mother to shake herself that the paddy-hill may grow as large as a mountain. Some Sioux formulae involve endearing phrases of kinship, and the wish is uttered with the sacrifice. Countless ceremonies attend prayers. Quaint forms of words are often used, e. g., in dispatching the ghost of the dead to its home. A Vedic hymn says, "Thou, O Agni, art our father, and we thy kinsmen." A Babylonian prayer begins: "I have no mother; thou art my mother. I have no father; thou art my father." Some prayers are spell narratives on the idea that talking of a thing causes it to happen. Much medicine magic aims at purification. The African witch doctor holds his fetish up over the patient and prays, "Father heaven, bless this medicine." The Klonds conclude all their prayers for special favours with the phrase, "We are ignorant of what is good for us; you know; give it to us." Giesbrecht in, "Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens," shows the wondrous power ascribed to the divine name. The Latin pontifices concealed it lest it be wrongly used, and Euripides speaks of the wise man "who knows the silent names of the gods." The Greek liturgies sometimes enumerate several epithets, or call on the God of many names. A chorus in Aesculapius says, "Zeus, whoever the god is, if this name of Zeus is dear to him, by this name I appeal." So, in India, Agni is immortal and of many names, and the Egyptian Ra has manifold names unknown even to the gods. So the name Yahveh was sacred, if not potent, and the Christian is baptized into the name of Christ. Not only does knowing the name of the deity give power over him, but to know his origin works as a charm. The Veda says, "O sleep, we know thy breath; thou art the ender, death; protect us from evil dreams," etc. The ancient Germans thought the rune the rival if not the parent of prayer, and in the Middle Ages the Holy Ghost was a name thought to make blood, skin, and bone grow again after injury.

Even in ancient England the prayer charm was used against sterility of the land, much as in ancient Greece agricultural petitions were uttered. The devotee glancing into the sky simply said, "Rain and conceive." Similar spells were used for human fertility. The

Romans were prone to invoke the spirits of ancestors, held that there was great power in repetition, dancing and in uttering the words, "*Io triumphe.*" The famous Roman address to Jupiter in the days of Hannibal's War was a legal document shrewdly drawn to bind both the god and the state. Greece had an official liturgy containing curses on certain offences against the state, and both Jews and Christians have curse formulae consecrating their victim to the lower world and constraining the very gods. A savage oath says, "May this fetish slay me if I do not fulfil this contract." Socrates commended the Spartans for not praying for particular gifts, but only for what was beautiful and good. Very lofty is Pindar's prayer: "May I walk, O God, in the guileless paths of life and leave behind me a fair name for my children," and "O God that bringest all things to pass, grant me the spirit of reverence for noble things." Euripides prays: "May the spirit of chastity, the fairest gift of God, abide with me," and in a much-used banquet song the Greeks prayed, "O Pallas, born of waters, Queen Athene, may thou and thy father keep this city and its citizens in prosperity, free from sorrow, civic discord, and untimely death." Xenophon prays, for "Good life, bodily strength, good feeling among friends, safety in war, and wealth." Socrates prays: "Grant me to become noble of heart"; Apollonius, "O gods, grant me that which I deserve"; Plato, "King Zeus, grant us the good, whether we pray for it or not, but keep the evil from us, though we pray for it." Epictetus prayed: "Do with me what thou wilt. Thy will is my will." And the early Stoics prayed: "Lead me, O God, and I will follow willingly, if I am wise, but if not willingly still I will follow." Some philosophical Christians early raised the question whether special prayers were justified, and it was on this view that the Pythagoreans at one time forbade prayer because the gods know better what to give than men do what to ask. They also held that all prayer should be aloud, so that no one would pray for anything he would be ashamed for others to hear. Neo-Platonism stressed the idea of communion with God. The only prayer of Apuleius was, "that thou wouldst be willing to keep us all our lives in the love of knowledge." The Vedic thought was that the gods uphold the sky and do all their work by prayer. A very ancient prayer is, "With my mind do I seize your mind," and again, to Agni, "May we be well-doers before the gods," and again, "Give us not up, O Agni, to want of thought; make us sinless before

Aditi; put far away the sins of the mind; enter into smoke, O sin, go into the vapours, and into the fog." With such prayers often went potent symbols of purification. Among the Iranians a real spell could accompany only a real prayer, the text of which was very potent in the hands of the "sacerdotal physician." He prays, "Give us, Ahura, that powerful sovereignty by the strength of which we may smite down the sickness demon," and then, turning to it, he says, "To thee, O sickness, I say avaunt; to thee, O death, I say avaunt." The holy word is of such a nature that if all the corporeal and living world should learn it and, learning, hold fast to it, they would be redeemed from their mortality. The Persian prayers are even higher than the Vedic in their conception of righteousness. Before rising the pious Persian prays, "All good thoughts, all good words, all good deeds, I do willingly. All evil thoughts, all evil words, all evil deeds, I do unwillingly. May we help bring on the good government of Ahura." "How may man become most like unto thee? I implore through the good mind a kingdom for myself, through whose increase I may conquer the lie." In Babylon Marduk is often invoked as the arch magician and there were experts and spells in purification, and yet lofty types of faith that "prayer absolves from sin." One of the greatest of all prayers is that of Nebuchadnezzar to Marduk on his ascension: "O eternal ruler, Lord of all . . . lead the king by the right way . . . I am the work of thy hand. Father, the great mercy which thou showest to all, grant that thy high majesty, O Lord, may now show compassion on me. Set in my heart the fear of thy Godhead. Grant me what thou deemest best, for thou it is that hast created my life." Another king prays for his first-born that he may commit no sin, and another that he may reign "according to thy wish. Let me not in my pride lose true knowledge of thee." Another prays: "Set righteousness on my lips, and grace in my heart." "Marduk is the God full of mercy who lives to quicken what is dead," and Ishtar is "the helper of the oppressed, endowed with majesty, who raisest the fallen and exaltest the trodden underfoot." Some of these prayers to Marduk rise to an almost prophetic loftiness and suggest the best of the prophets. In Egypt the idea of spells oppressed the soul, and both gods and worshippers used them toward each other, the latter sometimes with such confident faith that the prayer seems nothing less than a command. This is especially seen in the "Book of the Dead," over

whom entrancing words were used that their souls might become divine. Prayer amulets and symbols were very prominent at every stage of this most elaborate of all the cults of death. In one case the soul addresses Ammon: "I am a perfect spirit among the companions of Ra, and I have gone in and come forth among the perfect souls; grant unto me the things which my body needeth and heaven for my soul and a hidden space for my mummy." Everywhere here we find magic prayer, intense conviction, trust in pictures, words of power, and sacred texts.

In Christianity Clement developed the first theory of prayer. The true gnostic, he says, "works himself with God in his prayer so as to attain perfection." Thus prayer is not merely petitionary, but a self projection. So Origen thought prayer was chiefly communion. Still the gnostics used the old magic often suggesting the mimetic acts of lower faiths in their ritual under new names, such as prayer, blessing the baptismal water on the eve of Epiphany, with thrice dipping of the crucifix into it, symbolic of the sweetening of the bitter water with wood, in Exodus. Some of the formulae of the Church are masterpieces of synthesis of intoned chant with the subtle value of suggestion and a typical act with prayer. But we must not forget that it was the belief in demons, possession, and exorcism that sustained the spell theory of prayer in the early Christian ages. Indeed, it has so strong a hold that I know of no suggested reforms of liturgy that would entirely eliminate it.

We now often regard prayer as an end in itself rather than as a means. It is a function of adjustment to fate or fortune, often seeking to make the best out of the worst. The extreme expression of this attitude is that, although the Lord slay and doom him to hell, the saint will acquiesce, justify the divine way, and strive to accept even this fate with consolation if not with joy. This of course assumes that all evil is partial good, and involves a struggle up to an absolute standpoint. Renunciation has its own inspiration, and is the ambivalent opposite of the Titanism that when brought to bay defies heaven and dies with malediction. Indeed destiny is a divine will to which ours must give way, and this element of prayer is all acquiescence and seeks to regard evil as purification, which is more complete the hotter the furnace of tribulation. One function of philosophy is to bring us to abandon freely even the life that fate will one day require of us. This involves, not merely facing death with equanimity and dignity, but a

sense that nothing happens without sufficient reason, and that our extinction would be tolerable if it advanced the glory of God. The race is of course the end to which the individual is utterly subordinated, and so the race itself may be a means to be subordinated to a higher end, and that to a still higher one in indefinite perspective. Thus there is not only a joy but a passion in utter self-sacrifice and immolation.

Prayer psychologically considered does not presuppose invocation or any special concept of any being to whom the prayer is addressed, so that an agnostic or atheist can truly pray. "O God, if there is a God, save my soul, if I have a soul," is a real prayer. True prayer, too, may be addressed to stalks, stones, trees, and idols, sun, moon, stars, ether; and it would be easy to quote genuine cases of it to about every false deity the world has ever known. The savage who conceives things below man and prays downward, as we think, never does so according to his own idea. Anything, indeed, may be a medium through which man reaches the great heart of the world, and while the new convert may see God alike in all things, the soul generally makes a very distinct *Objekt-Wahl*, and through this seeks confidential converse, dialogue, or to make incursions into a higher realm, or to receive visitations from it. Thus the culmination of prayer is psychologically very analogous in the moral sphere to the hedonic narcosis that Schopenhauer ascribes to the moment of most intense aesthetic contemplation with surcease of all pain. This is why mystic prayer is sometimes so regenerating. "He prays best who loves best," and the acme of the communion of love is a transport which usually leaves the soul permanently changed because it has been caught up by the oversoul and received a higher potentialization. The soul has reopened the original well-spring of life and perhaps glimpsed its own final destiny, augmented every higher motivation. This makes prayer in a sense the opener of new and higher ways, the purest psychic expression of the evolutionary push-up in us. Moozumdar once told me how he insisted on a cupola on his Bombay College, in which, Christian though he was, he encouraged his students to develop the old Buddhistic cult of sitting cross-legged alone, high above the earth, in quiet, turning the soul inward, trying to escape from the great fatigue, watching the greater stars come out in the inner life as the garish little sun of consciousness set. His idea was not so much to evacuate the mind in the contemplation

of Nirvana as to reinforce it by attaining perfect nervous poise and repose as a kind of higher rest cure. Or rather the goal was to hear the still, small voice of man's truest nature, to develop some consciousness of our higher, more perfect and generic self, which he deemed the true vocation of man, which consisted in communing with and drawing out his own genius, and feeling its incubation. Western thought has often recognized, though in a far fainter way, this higher autodidactic element in the soul. Indeed, in a sense, not only the mystic contemplation striving to reach the superessential, but even the scientific bottoming on some absolute space, ether, energy; Kant's autonomous oughtness, supreme over every heteronomous motive; Schleiermacher's feeling of absolute dependence, which will always be correlated with Hegel's idea of absolute freedom; the passionate Edwardsian love of being; the love which for Jesus and Paul is the fulfilling of the law—these, and indeed all the higher impulsions of the soul, down through the whole history of the categories, testify that man has experienced something in his own nature that is authoritative, unfallen, capable of being normative in his life. Man cannot work out these themes in the form of personal vital experience without being devout. They are the permanent and essential parts of his higher nature, and the act of bringing them out is, in its most generic aspect, prayer. They are the best things in us, and perhaps the very hardest to get at because they are elements of our very personality. They give all the worth there is to every proof of immortality, and we might well abase ourselves before them, as if they were not parts of us but of God incarnate in us. Here it is that we live in him and he in us. Indeed, if man does not become one with the eternal in this realm of inner unity of intuitions, feelings and desires, he remains forever separated from it in all the derived unities of consciousness.

One function of prayer is praise, which may lapse to adulation and flattery, with which the Orient particularly exalts the *amour propre* of potentates. We enumerate the physical, metaphysical, moral attributes of the great *Autos* with abandon and superlativeness, eulogizing him with endless panegyrics for his great achievements in the past. We invoke him as over all lords, kings, rulers, with a kind of poetic license not unmixed with a consciousness that praise is the best exordium for requests. True praise involves a profound sense of sublimity, which is perhaps the best expander of the soul, even inspiring

creation in the sense of Ruskin, who insists that "all art is praise." In this direction, at least, lie some of the loftiest human thoughts and feelings. The vast modern enlargement of the universe greatly enhances this attitude toward the divine, so that of him who best knows philosophy and science it can be said, as it was long ago of the astronomer, that if undevout he is mad. The vastation of knowledge broadened with progress of the suns is a growing incitement to this devotional attitude and tends to bring man metaphorically to his knees. At an age when the spirit of criticism tends to paralyze the higher powers of appreciation, when men are prone to take greater pleasure in looking down than in looking up, and the instinct of reverence languishes, this element of praise ought to be a theme of careful psychopedagogic study and ought to be developed, for its cult is capable of a far greater function and value than it has ever had in giving man the new orientation he still lacks to the new world of science.

The most important element in prayer psychologically considered is confession. The instinct to tell instead of to conceal our faults is sometimes very strong, so that relatives and lawyers may have to contend against this impulse in clients they are defending, and suicide is sometimes a form of confession. So social is man that both his sins and troubles seem halved by sharing them with a confidant. In some temperaments the impulse to confess even sins that may bring legal penalties and ostracism or that excite feelings of repulsion, all of which silence might escape, is so sudden that it might be called spasmodic. It may be prompted by a sense of danger so intolerable that even the worst social penalty is voluntarily incurred in order to relieve the psychic tension, just as men often have such horror of altitudes that they throw themselves down from heights. I have often been tempted to coin a word, *poinetropia* (*poine* = penalty), to express the fascination that punishments for real faults may sometimes have. Plato thought that bad men in their hearts hungered for the retribution due their evil deeds; and in the annals of crime, and sometimes in common life, we certainly meet this impulsion, rare and overlaid as it usually is by the selfish instincts of escaping pain generally, and also by the Christian habit of regarding the atonement as superseding the reign of justice in the world. If in error, admit; if in fault, tell it frankly, whether to the person injured, physician, priest, friend, or God, for this is the true way of honour, chivalry, manhood, and brings great and instant ease-

ment. Confession shows good intentions to be deeper than our faults, and as in some sense sloughing off the latter as an alien and not our true self. Moreover, confession lets in the light of another's knowledge upon propensities that can flourish only in the darkness of concealment. It is reparation and balm for wounds that we inflict. We must chiefly remember, moreover, that the lie came into the world to cloak sin, and this is still its chief motive. No one lies to conceal virtue, but the first and worst lies are to veil wrongdoing.[1] Heinroth, the Berlin alienist, conceived all disease, insanity and sin included, as lies, because perversion of nature's intent in us; and Nordau and many others (for this topic has now a copious literature) have shown how deep-seated mendacity is in the conventions of modern society. Thus when an individual or a civilization gives up the lie and falls back upon the real self by robustly speaking, thinking, acting the truth and wishing to be accepted for what it really is by nature and heredity, a joy and peace so great that it is often well called regeneration supervenes. Thus sins and lies have the same root; or, in theological phrase, the same Diabolus, as their father. The worst result is when men come to believe their own lies, as they always tend to do, and when lies work themselves into the soul and remain unassimilated like surds or foreign bodies, vitiating the roots of character. To some morbid souls there comes a strange exhilaration in the blankest kind of lying, insisting that white is black when gazing upon it. This gives a sense of emancipation from reality, asserts the sovereignty of arbitrariness, and makes conscience conscious. To say the thing that is not, and deny the thing that is, seem inspiration for some moral inverts. This pseudomania to lie where the truth would better serve one's purpose, as great souls sacrifice for the truth, brings out a kind of self-consciousness that might be called mental masturbation. Of course, too, men have prayed to and devoted their lives to the powers of evil, and there have been those who strove deliberately to commit every known sin, as the history of Antichrist and Satanism shows. But we should not forget that practically all devils are ex, fallen, or emeritus gods that have been dethroned, and conversely that the best gods are devils many times refined and reformed and the highest in a series of many substitutions, and that it is a psychic trait of man, as his elimination of the missing link has shown, to abhor the second best more than he does

[1] See my "Children's Lies," *Ped. Sem.*, Vol. I, p. 211. Also Delbrück: "Die psychologische Lüge." Stuttgart, 1891.

the fifth or tenth best. If prayer is real truth in word and deed, it always involves contrition (or literally trituration) of self and of pride, which are the roots of sin and lies. For if they are not expurgated the soul is dualized. If confession to one halves, confession to many, which is harder, still more diminishes guilt, especially if voluntary. Auricular confession in the Catholic Church meets a great need for which Protestantism has no adequate substitute. Priestly confidence is inviolate and respected even by Courts in cases of the greatest crimes. It may, of course, be abused or become mechanical, perfunctory, or too institutionalized. But if genuine and contrite it is its own absolution. In Dostoyefsky's "Crime and Punishment" the detective long had proof enough to convict the criminal, but worked to bring about his full confession, feeling that this should be the goal of every detective. The ancient Jews and Teutons were too proud to confess to any but God, but the more social Southern races have long found peace in confessing to accredited men. Disclosures to God are secret, the difficulty of avowal is lessened, and there is little virtue in being honest to the omniscient Searcher of hearts. But if we consider confession for what it truly is, viz., deepening self-knowledge, it may be in itself the best autotherapy. Round terms or mere enumerations are not enough, but poignancy of regret and improvement can come only with specification. Of course the devotee who babbles to God that he is a vile wretch, polluted with sin, if taken literally would be expelled from Church, placed under a social ban, boycotted or outlawed. This kind of confession is a mere parody of the real thing, but even this seems to have for some its charm, because many have confessed to sins they never committed and had almost a mania for magnifying those they had. This, however, is easily explainable. Hystericals gratify their instinct to be interesting by inventing heinous offences with a prodigality of fancy and detail that misleads adepts. Feeling that they have done wrong beyond the possibility of complete and exhaustive acknowledgment, they magnify the errors they recall, so that the sum of sin may be sure to be offset by the equivalent amount of confession. In other words, they make the bad they remember worse than it is to cancel forgotten and unconfessed faults, the former in technical terms being overcharged with affectivity. Of course brooding distorts true proportions, while sometimes the sin is felt to be so deep-seated that convulsive efforts are necessary to exteriorize it. Some, too, become

habitual inebriates of the sense of relief that telling brings, so that they appropriate and disgorge every sin they hear of. In Jeremy Taylor's "Ductor Dubitantium," in the records of the old Fulton Street daily prayer meeting, which I once perused, and in all the literature of casuistry and autobiographies of great saints and great sinners, one finds copious illustrations of all these abnormalities, every one of which now has its close analogue in the literature of personal hygiene and autotherapy.

Remarkable new light, which has shown confession to be one of the central themes of humanistic impulse, has lately been thrown on it in the recent development of abnormal psychology, especially in the line begun by Breuer and Freud,[1] the pith of which is as follows: When a nervous system is a little loosened in its texture, as in puberty, or by reason of hereditary defect, exhaustion, or some sudden or unusual experience, death, accident, or sin, the tension thus caused often becomes too great to be worked off by the laws of associative thinking, the function of which is to adjust to and assimilate the new fact, painful though it is. It cannot be expressed by normal actions, reflexes, gestures, or words. In such a case the generated excitement overflows, diffuses, and tends to find or break out new paths. It now becomes a question of lines of least resistance, as in the nasal irritation that normally issues in a sneeze, when, if the latter is delayed the excitement irradiates to eyes, brain, glands, respiration, etc., or as a riddle may excite great tension until the answer is found. Goethe felt psychic pain after very strong feeling till he had expressed it in poetry. In weakened subjects this vent for psychic excitement may be found in digestive or circulatory pains or convulsions, in tonic or clonic cramps, etc., till one or more of these, although abnormal, become habitual. When thus these exciting causes become real psychic traumata, when they break out in these unnatural lines, when ideogenic causes thus issue in somatic symptoms, the latter physical phenomena take the place of consciousness, which may be quite lost with hardly any accessible trace. Perhaps, e. g., a series of cramps or digestive disturbances, started by a painful psychic experience, draws off the energy so completely that the experience itself is entirely forgotten. Now, when in such cases the memory of the cause and all its attendant circumstances can be brought point by point and vividly into

[1] "Studien über Hysterie." Leipzig, 1895.

consciousness, whether by question, suggestion, or hypnotism, and everything can be vividly reproduced with the attendant feelings and movements, and thus the psychic reaction be dramatically restored, then the abnormal symptom vanishes because its surrogate has been restored in consciousness. This "auricular confession," as these authors term it, plucks out the cause of the disorder which had acted as a foreign body in the soul, so that its functions are "converted" back to normality. Such patients suffer from "forgotten reminiscence," which is exorcised by this process. So in the larger racial field Mansoul has been scarred by the long and bitter struggle of survival. Not only is the soul warped but the system has experienced washouts of passion that have broken through dams of restraint and gullied the psychophysic organism with many a lesion. Sense, appetite, sex, disease, have left their marks upon him. Storms of anger have howled through his nature, so that both his conscious and unconscious life have been perverted. Psychic pestilence and contagion, like greed, drink, war, witchcraft, fetishism, fanaticism, have left some of his nervous functions more or less insane, so that his organism is a resonance chamber of the long historic travail to escape the ape and tiger in him, to get loose of Plato's dark steed harnessed to the white one, or of the body of death predisposed to leipothumia. At various points we have reacted wrongly to our environment. Not only our world but our experience has grown vastly too large for our intelligence to respond to it aright.

But deep as is the depravity, it is not total, or man's case would be hopeless. There is always a saving remnant of good. Fortunately not only the worst individuals but the worst elements of man's nature have been eliminated, and the best carefully preserved. Bad as man is to-day, he has unquestionably been vastly worse in the past, so that the sense of personal and ancestral sin that has always been so strong has never been without hope of restoration. Thus the religious conception of Jesus' suffering is more or less reflected in the depths of the soul where slumber the almost effaced and deeply overlaid traces of the goodness of man's first "intention." The first stage of cure and rescue, then, is the Aristotelian katharsis that comes by inner rehearsal of the fall, the re-experience in weakened, imaginary form of the pride, anger, lust, that seem to have done their worst for us in order to arouse the higher powers that control and correct them. Nelson long ago showed

how habitual forms of bad dreams and nightmares might be prevented by rehearsing them in thought faintly just before going to sleep. So the soul may acquire a certain immunity from temptation by reënacting its drama on the mimic shadow stage of consciousness and thus robbing it of its sting of actual sin. How deep this realization of the perversity of our conduct and nature can go is an individual matter. Some can feel guilty only for a few overt acts in their lives, and very few can realize the ravages of our remote inheritance. To do this we need to have some conception of ideally perfect human nature, and only the embodiment of this could adequately feel the full weight of sin or realize the degree of man's alienation from his norm. Of course, conviction of unworthiness and admission of it even to self means that schism has begun and that purgation may follow. The bad is set clearly over against the good, and resonances of "vague snatches of Uranian antiphone" begin to be felt. A tribunal is erected; the soul is judging with all its might and main. The law written in the heart is revived, for man is confessing to himself and the moult of his baser nature is beginning. This is the most inner and intimate of all the functions of prayer, the most saving of all works, the greatest of all rescues. It implies the highest vitality and momentum of further development. Indeed, it suggests to us that the chief function of self-consciousness is remedial because its very existence is due to our deviation from the true law of our own being. Thus the fall of man was from instinct and intuition to self-consciousness, which is like a wart made on a tree by the sting of an insect, except that when the end of perfection is attained it may be eliminated.[1] Recent writers have urged in a very sentimental way that man learned to speak in order to pray, and that as his language is the cry of the body, his prayer is that of his soul. It is inner speech "exciting our emotions." Strange as this is, we know that often abnormal functions tend to come to the front, and that as long as functions are undisturbed we are not conscious of them, so that to sense them is a danger signal which not only calls attention to where help is needed, but on the principle *ubi effluxus ibi affluxus* is itself of real therapeutic value. The conscious intellect, therefore, may have its prime function in making distinctions between right and wrong ways of thinking and acting, so that it is at bottom therapeutic

[1] Guimaraëns: "Le Besoin de Prier et ses Conditions Psychologiques." *Rev Philos.*, Oct, 1902.
A. Strindberg: "La Psychologie de la Prière." *Rev. Blanche*, Apr. 15 and May 1, 1895.

and curative. This gives us our deepest view of the confessional element in prayer. To tell the Great Companion, or an idle spectator, or a human confidant, is itself a way of salvation. To acknowledge is not only to objectify but to heterize. Confession is thus truly apotropaic, and this was the goal of all primitive, if not of every other kind of sacrifice. What is thus alienated ceases to be part of us, is already partitioned off from us, and this is the psychic root of pardon. Only the sin that is thus exteriorized or doomed to exclusion is forgotten because only this reveals the higher self which is foreign to it. It must still be punished in the body, or even in the mind, of the individual; but something higher now stands forth that had no participation in its commital, and is therefore itself exempt from either guilt or penalty. The exuviæ may still cling to us, and we suffer pain; but the other purer, more interior part of us, remains pure. Thus confession becomes, as Hegel in his "Phenomenology" says, the act of sovereignty of the soul by which it forgives itself because it has no longer any part or lot in the punishment that may supervene.

Prayer, in the modern psychological sense of meditation and self-communion in quiet hours, when we inventory our interests, powers and ideals, and commune with the deeper racial self within us, is a cult that greatly needs and, indeed, is now to some extent having a revival. In the prayer books of the Church, and lately in many new prayers composed for those in various callings and for those facing special exigencies or choices, and more specifically in the prayers composed for soldiers in the field, we realize again the pregnant sense in which man is a praying animal. Prayer should keep alive the aspirations of youth, so many of which are prone to fade as we advance in life. It should refine but never destroy them, for it is one of the chief strongholds of ideality, and rightly used gives the truest and most practical self-knowledge and self-control. When collective, it makes a unique synthesis between members of a social whole, and when solitary, as it should also always be at times, it brings and keeps us in touch with the submerged self within us and taps its measureless resources. Of all autodidactic agencies it is perhaps thus the most synthetic and unifying, bringing together feeling, will, and intellect, the conscious and the unconscious, the individual and his social environment. Nature lovers, artists, and also quite notably children, have evolved special formal prayers in both prose and poetry to express for them what are

ideal attitudes, toward the aspects of nature, society, duty, temptations, studies, vocations, etc. Sometimes individuals develop a personal mark, sign, or symbol, book-plate, bit of art or diagram, incorporating into it often the inmost secrets of their lives, which they would not impart to their most intimate friends. This is really a prayer, for it expresses their most ardent wishes. At the opposite extreme of generality stands, of course, the immortal petition of Our Lord, which is so perfect that in all its history I find but few improvements have even been suggested as possible. The chief of these has been repeatedly expressed in the wish that to the petition "Deliver us from evil" he might have added "and ignorance," so that the advance in knowledge and science should have had recognition, for this might have mitigated the long conflict between piety and reason.

(1) There is no such quintessential synopsis of the Christian consciousness in brief form as is attained in the Lord's Prayer, which is an outline of its chief attitudes toward the world and is on the whole the high-water mark of the moral developmental instincts of the human soul. To address as "Father" the background of the universe, its source, principle, the unknown reservoir out of which all things sprang, be it ether, energy, or something forever above all name or thought, marked a flash of creative genius or an inspiration richer in anticipations and more transforming in its beneficent influences than perhaps any other single conception of the religious soul. If man's pedigree is now conceived to go back through the amœba to some matrix, mother-lye or cosmic gas, it is, nevertheless, to a father, and the stages of our evolution are all procreative. Creation is an act of generation by which the great One and All transmits his own inmost essence to the world. He is here personated, and we are connected not only with his somatic but with his yet more fundamental spermatic elements. Just so far as we are true and legitimate children, therefore, we, too, are divine in the same sense that he is, and if nature in its most comprehensive sense is the total product of all his creativeness, it is no less divine than he. Otherwise, generative stages are degenerate and decadent. The offspring is not equal to the parent, or all Godhood is not expressed in creation or revealed in mind and its products. Indeed, this mode of address seems at first a product of Titanic overweaning, heaven-storming pride, which to the Greek would rouse divine jealousy and invite wrath. The emphasis here, however, is more upon

beneficence, present guidance, and parental care, so that our attitude in thus addressing the Source of all things is that of a child in frank relations to an all-powerful parent, abounding in love and inclined to answer all reasonable petitions. Pindar devoted his great genius in part to tracing back the pedigree of the successful athletes at Olympia to the heroes of an older day, Apollo, Hercules, and other deities of the Greek Pantheon. But by the appellation "father" the Christian declares that the heavenly ichor of the only living and true God flows in his own veins by direct, literal, linear heredity, and this consciousness therefore fortifies and emboldens all his petitions. Indeed, this is the greatest altitude which the soul reaches in its animistic, anthropomorphizing impulse to construe the universe into congruence with man's highest possible conception of himself. Evolution cannot be conceived or represented in a more artistic or personal way, and far as science has now removed us from the beginnings of creation, the fact that creative evolution is here represented, not as a fiat or an act of mechanical construction but as the most intimate projection of self, should make man feel henceforth forever at home in his world. It is only anaemic sentiment that interprets fatherhood according to the degenerate ways often seen in contemporary addresses to God, which often show traces of sentimentality, querulousness, over-intimacy, the familiarity born of imperfect respect, or the assumption that love means indulgence of whims until our attitude suggests that of spoiled children. Even if, as we are now told, the father complex in this higher application is fashioned on the human parent, this conception keeps fatherhood dignified and worthy, and suggests to each earthly father an added motive so to live and discharge his whole duty and function as head of his household that his children shall form the largest and highest possible ideas of him, so that when they are transferred to the heavenly All-Father they shall not be too faulty.

(2) The Father addressed is ours and not mine. This implies the solidarity of the human race, and might easily be extended to imply that of all animate and, perhaps, inanimate existence. Even though we pray alone, it is not selfish but with initial recognition that it is to a God upon whom all other creatures have the same claim as we. Mankind, especially, is a confraternity. We are all of one family, and every ideal of Catholicism and universality lurks under this pronoun. Its connotations are in fact wide or narrow just in proportion to the span

of the horizon of our own consciousness. He is the Father of even our enemy, who would imprecate us; for he sends rain upon the evil as well as upon the good. In fine, not only mutuality and brotherhood, but consubstantiality with the entire world upon the ground of genetic relationship to a common source, are involved.

(3) He is in heaven. Toward it, rather than toward the rising sun, toward Mecca, Jerusalem, Benares, or any altar, crucifix, or shrine, we should direct our prayers. Man is by the etymology of his Greek name the upward-looking being. The erect position was acquired after long experience of anthropoid ancestors whose arboreal habits freed the forelimbs from the necessity of the work of locomotion, so that they could be instruments for more intellectual tasks. Like our Aryan ancestors or the classic statue of the Greek youth, we extend our hands supine upward. We pray up into the void of space, we look away from the earth toward the nebulae, ether, and sky, on the same principle that the *raja-yoga* gazes at his navel in passing into the rapt state of contemplation, because it is our origin, and because, like all the other worlds and all that is in them, we are in some mysterious way secreted out of the heavens from which still comes our help. Indeed, to have a sense of reality above us (which we owe in no small measure to clouds and the fancies spun about them, and to thunder) acquires and implies a certain spiritualization of soul. For primitives, belief in and reverence of powers above, so vividly felt in storms, are akin to what Renan has shown to be the effect of such phenomena at Sinai upon the plain-dwelling Hebrews, viz., to make God more actually present, near, fearful, etc. The Aryan mind, too, has developed more richly than any other the mythology which personifies celestial objects and phenomena. More effective yet is perhaps the overwhelming sense of our own littleness and insignificance, most of all intensified in contemplating the infinities of time and space which an upward glance suggests. Man is profoundly uranotropic. Devoutness, reverence, humility, which are the distinctive features of the religious mind, culminate when our thoughts take this direction, and find their homeward orientation to be also heavenward. Even more than Kant's undevout astronomer, those who contemplate infinite space without devout sentiments may be called mad.

(4) His name is to be hallowed. God is thus above all name, and greater than anything that can be called thought, even in this scien-

tific age. Our minds cannot apprehend, and still less comprehend, this vastest of all possible objects, too great, indeed, to be objectified. He is the one and all; the great Pan himself personified. But worship requires some form, concept, or at least a term with some appellative significance in it. God's name may be the whole body of science, a system of philosophy, an evolutionary cosmogenic scheme of things. He, of whom all nouns are but partial names, all verbs designations of his acts, all adjectives of his qualities, should have for each of us some symbol or thought-form, or should be brought home by some special type of experience connected with some time or space, or at least some word above all others to connote some and denote all others of his attributes. All high art, all science and religion, which strive to formulate ultimates, are wrestling, as Jacob did with the angel, for the revelation of a new name, and names have always had magic power. Atoms, vortexes, monads, reals, ether, vitality, force, mind, reason, beauty, virtue, truth, entelechy, cause, infinity, and all the categories of philosophy which Trendelenburg collected, as well as the fundamental concepts of science, are part names of our polynomous Father in Heaven. The prayer here is that all these be respected and recognized as more or less holy. The Christian as well as the Jewish consciousness has been haunted by fears of blasphemy as the one unpardonable sin, and its awful prohibition is against every degree of such an offence. Of course the divine name is not hallowed when men become indifferent to or contemptuous of these higher strivings to close in with ultimate reality, the efforts of which we must not allow even pragmatism to interfere with. Not so much the agnostic who insists that none of these are names of reality, and that all noumenal existence eludes and is forever beyond our ken and reach, nor the pessimist who declares that what we know of it indicates that it is bad, malign, disruptive, or diseased, is here contemplated—but rather he who has lost the power to respect those products of human endeavour which are most worthy of reverence because seeking best to embody the divine, even if it be only an idol, an elaborate ceremonial rite, a theology, or a fruitful scientific hypothesis. The deities of other and even savage faiths, too, should be hallowed just so far as they mark stages in this incessant and weary quest of man to understand, grasp, and achieve some kind of unity of what to lower creatures seems the booming, incoherent, chaotic, snarl of things that we dare call a universe. The soul has

always sought God, and all its attempts to proximate him are not without sacredness.

(5) "Thy will be done" is not merely the invocation of a theocratic rule, but the expression of an earnest wish that pure oughtness reconstruct and flow through every sphere of life and mind. Our wills are full of picæ, whims, perversity. They are uninstructed and, above all, prone to be selfish. The divine will, of which the really educated conscience is so commonly thought to be the best oracle, is here invoked to irrigate human conduct and mind in all details both of the higher and the lower vocation of man.

We should not be absorbed by selfishness or inclination, but all our acts should have not only a supreme sanction but a supreme motivation. This is not adequately formulated, even in Kant's lofty precept of so acting that all we do could be made a principle of universal lawgiving. But it rather means acting as we should wish to act if we saw all things in their largest possible relations, and apprehended all the subtle conflicts of duties which casuistry has so tediously sought to rubricize. Nor does this imply only an ethical rigorism that requires us to act against desire, nor an exiguous prying Puritan conscience, but it recognizes a diaphoria or No Man's Land of neutral deeds, intermediate between right and wrong. It allows us to conceive that the Great Author of nature so organized it that pleasure is in very many things the best of all guides, although, because sin has entered this fallen world that has its cause, effect, or both, pleasure now has its limitations fixed by adamantine laws. Thus, if we ever have a complete evaluation of pleasures by which they can be weighed, measured, or graded as high and low, and the absolute value of each determined with reference to the chief end of man, this conflict will be eliminated and a higher hedonism become the surest guide in all issues.

God's will is benign if evolution is his work, because in the bitter struggle for existence the fittest and best have survived, while others have perished, and hence in human affairs it is best expressed in those acts and institutions that tend to bring man to the very fullest maturity of which he is capable. If man's nature is on the whole good and true, then those tendencies that are deepest and most universal are modes of executing this will, and the true nature of man as distinct from everything factitious is here desiderated.

(6) The prayer for the Kingdom expresses an idea that has

prompted philanthropy, fired missionary zeal, and inspired many an effort by deeds and books to reconstruct society. The visible Church is supposed to be its representative, and the ideal Church or the heavenly New Jerusalem is its realization. Heaven is attractive because it is conceived as a community of moral, *élite* souls existing in relations to one another which realize every noble human aspiration. Man is a social being, or, in Aristotle's phrase, a political animal, and although his attempts to organize society, the records of which almost constitute history, have failed at many periods and in many respects, the dream of ideality was perhaps never more vivid and in some aspects of it more detailed than now. From Plato to Comte, Bellamy, George, in many a philanstery and social and religious community, secret societies, sodalities, clubs, profit-sharing and coöperative schemes, to say nothing of reform movements in city, state, national government or Church, we see tentatives toward the realization of this item in the great petition. How can men best live together in such a way that the worst shall be most effectively repressed and the best most favoured, is a problem never more pressing and never more studied than now. Just in proportion as sociologists, economists, and publicists can so adjust business and society until they make a perfect placentum in which man can be brought to his greatest perfection, they are helping to usher in the Kingdom. It will not come suddenly; and probably, as the world is more and more united and in *rapport*, each part with all others, no one place or land will take great precedence. The millennial state, if social evolution ever realizes it, will not be primeval paradise, or any clannish organization of gregarious instincts, but it will be world-wide. We may sometime approximate it by gently and wisely constraining lower races to take up the white man's ways; but most truly and surely will it be realized where the instincts of each ethnic stock are developed naturally upon their own foundations. We are already beginning to see that the secret of colonization and missionary work is to allow native races the largest freedom to do their own thing in their own way, if it does not involve grave and irreparable loss. The statesman of the future, moreover, will deliberately take for his problem, not the grafting of a more highly domesticated scion into wild stock, but the legitimate development of what is everywhere, even in the lowest aboriginal tribes, found to be already begun. In plainer words, the ideal is this: when by careful and all-sided anthropological

study it has been found out just what the family, tribal, and other organizations of primitive races really are, what their myths, customs, rites, and beliefs truly mean, it will then have to be very carefully considered, on the basis of this knowledge, how most effectively, with least loss either of energy or of what has already been accomplished, the next and then the next higher step can be taken. Then we shall recognize the fact that what we now call civilization is not the only one; but that radically different civilizations that contravene perhaps many of our fundamental political, social, and even economic axioms are possible, and that there are perhaps as many undeveloped cultures and religions as there are languages capable of further development, some of which may indeed ultimately become far higher than any now known, but which are now simply arrested at some lower stage of evolution or made retrogressive, not so much from any inherent defect of the idea or system but from some accident of hygiene, location, food, or some error of misconception of crucial factors, or, alas, sometimes by suppression or perversion of good things by a stronger alien race. Real colonial statesmanship, if it ever becomes broad enough to realize this possibility, will be bringing in the Father's Kingdom in ways far more effective than cataclysmal reconstruction upon a single model, which often means the alienation of the best indigenous men, methods, and ideals. To attain the end here sought we must have a psychology broad enough to be truly called human. Indeed, every believer in evolution must realize that our present civilization, like older ones that have perished, may be sloughed off like the cast of a worm when the butterfly emerges from it. Nothing prompts the old man's visions and the young man's dream like these optimal possibilities of development of the superman in the superstate. The swan song of senescence sometimes cadences the highest aspirations of the soul, while the ideals of young men are the best material for prophecy, so that in them we find often what will be written as history half a century later. Such ideals supplement the limitations of what has already happened, by the larger complement of what will be when history really begins. The increasing purposes of God's will, which faith sees running through the ages, are often balked by popular frenzy, bigotry, corruption, and there have been stationary and retrograde centuries; but man to-day perhaps has more vital belief in the future of progress than ever before, whether on this earth or in a heavenly Kingdom, for both locations are

effective in the same direction. The conception of the primitive gnostic sect was of the preëxisting soul descending into the body of a new-born babe. Jesus, too, was said to have divested himself of ideality to become real on earth. Lotze dreamed of a state wherein his soul would some time hold high converse with Buddha, Plato, Mary, and above all, Jesus. Even if the earlier concepts of the Church are unsatisfying or even unattractive, we all look forward to a state of attainment, fulfilment, completion, where all things and persons will wear the aureole of the ideal. Dreams of Elysian conditions or of the Kingdom have sustained man in his hours of greatest pain and fear, because he has felt that all his sufferings would be accounted as investments in a heavenly bank. These antithetical and compensatory conceptions have thus had the greatest supportive power. As pre-Columbian navigators thought they could sail off on the sea, and, by direct continuity if they went far enough, reach the sun, moon, and stars, so the heavenly Kingdom as now interpreted is something that will be entered by imperceptible gradations, and there will be no break and no great commencement day as the earth slowly graduates into the Kingdom.

(7) The prayer for daily bread is for growth and nutrition, which is basal. Trophic prophecies underlie life, which has in the past been largely a struggle for food. In general, species have become extinct either because they failed to find it or became themselves food for other species. Hunger is the first and, with love, the strongest instinct. The bonds of commensality are the closest. Breaking bread together is more than a symbol of the closest brotherhood, and sometimes constitutes the act of marriage; while in many primitive tribes, as Trumbull has shown, the blood covenant, effected by mutual transfusion of blood, is the strongest of all ties. Famine and thirst bring out the most bestial qualities, and may cause one of the most dreadful forms of death. To feed the hungry is the most imperative charity, even before that of clothing the naked, and is the first duty of hospitality. Food colonies are the lowest social organizations in the animal world. There is a sense, too, brought home to us by the remarkable studies of the Pawlow school, supplemented by the work of Truro, Sternberg, and Dejerine from their very different standpoints, in which every psychic activity is due to the hunger of brain or other cells; these are fed by the satisfaction of curiosity, which abounds in anal-

ogies with appetite, while even the gastropathies and psychic anorexias are rich in spiritual analogies. All that lives, whether community or molecule, is on the way up if anabolism can do its work, or, if katabolism is excessive, begins to degenerate. Every disease, whatever its cause, involves partial starvation of some organ or tissue, which is shut off from its due irrigation by the blood, the all-feeding fluid. Food monopolies are the worst of all, and food adulteration is one of the most inimical of crimes. This petition, therefore, is not only the best of all table prayers as it stands, but is full of endless analogies in the psychic and moral realm.

(8) The forgiveness of debts is more remote from modern thought. Incurring debts is not unknown in primitive communities, where liberty and even life may be pledged to cancel obligations. The hope or promise to repay, however, enables poverty to maintain its self-respect. As property and its rites were developed, the laws against debtors were often very severe. They have been branded, labelled, pilloried, imprisoned, tortured, and even their families, relatives, and friends have suffered with them. They have been transported as convicts; and society regards improvidence, which the ants are a constant parable to avoid, with little leniency, although modern bankruptcy acts show an interesting evolution of sentiment in the direction of answering this item of the prayer of ages. Nevertheless, to forgive just debts is only one step easier than to love enemies. The evolution of property[1] shows that it arose as an extension of the ego. The rich man feels the pulsations of his own life in all he owns, somewhat as Lotze's clothes philosophy thinks one of their uses was to extend the sense of the wearer's physical ego. The millionaire feels himself almost identified with all his interests. Relinquishment therefore means restriction of the contours of his affective and effective personality, and is directly in the teeth of all instincts of self-aggrandizement. On the other hand, we are here reminded that we are all poor debtors before God's high assize. On the strict scale of debit and credit we owe our parents for food, clothing, protection, and care; we owe school or college, the city and state, for our protection; but above all, we owe to the heavenly Father not only all we have but all we are. There is no standard by which to measure this debt; but it is infinite and inextinguishable, so that all we have we should hold as his stewards

[1] See L. W. Kline and C. J. France: "Psychology of Ownership." *Ped. Sem.*, 1899.

with full accountability, for should he foreclose we should have nothing, and should lose life itself. The Stoics, even before the early Church, glimpsed this conception in challenging private ownership in anything essential for support of life and the common weal. Thus God owns us, body and soul, with absolute power so to dispose of us as he sees fit, for he made not only us but our world, and we are all his servants, either good or bad. This debt is only forgiven, therefore, when we become true sons, make his will ours, and hold all that we have and are as his factors. But it needs only insight and not mere Calvinistic blood to show that the race has drifted from this norm; that much has been overdone and much underdone; that substance has been wasted, effort misdirected; that the race has blundered along, so that real history is very different from what it should have been. We should treat others, therefore, as we would have God treat us. If our friends injure or owe us, we should be mindful of the great remissions we have enjoyed, and practise divine magnanimity. When impelled to exact even just claims upon those unable to meet them, we should simply think of our own faults and the penalties due us which we have escaped.

(9) As to temptation, it always ideally involves some moral waste; for life is easily conceived of as so pure that it can have no hold upon us, so that impeccability is more perfect if temptation has never been known. It usually involves deliberation, and always a moral conflict, suggesting the familiar proverb that the woman who deliberates is lost. While this sets forth the dangers of temptation, it is a glorification of her deeper intuitive natural instincts and automatic organization, but a libel on her intelligence and consciousness, because it implies their untrustworthiness, as if consideration, convention, the artifacts of education or environment, were less organized and therefore less to be trusted than intuition. If human nature had been radically bad, and the good superposed upon it by precept and training, the reverse would be true, and the woman who did not deliberate would be lost. Jesus thus expresses naïvely his belief in the fundamental goodness of human nature, and that it is not wise to commit virtue to the keeping of a deliberative moral consciousness where the pros and cons of right and wrong are weighed, debates with passion encouraged, and choices made as a result of careful consideration.

(10) "Deliver us from evil," has been, as we saw elsewhere, the

greatest of all solicitudes of the human soul, from the first apotropaic prayer and sacrifice to unknown powers down to our own day. All burnt offerings, all superstitious fears, especially those with a moral root, are bred of phobias of impending evil, which always threatens within and without. Not only did man struggle for ages with nature, with the great beasts of the prime, disease, and death; but his fate was jeopardized by rapacious passion, ignorance, and superstition. To escape evil prompts every effort, brings foresight, makes for survival and the accomplishment of our vocation as men. This item of the prayer expresses the perfervour of the desire not only for continuance and complete well-being, but for development. The answer to this prayer involves escape from post-mortem evil and the exemption of the soul from anxiety, the mother of all fears. It may involve, too, some deep Buddhistic insight into the ills inherent in all existence, and express the optative sentiment that we may pass safely through this vale of tears inoffensively, and immaculately innocent of every stain of finitude or even individuation. Fear of evil has been the spur that has created medicine and even science as prevision, as well as every protective immunizing or insuring agency, so that as in the former items we are touching another of the fundamentals of human life.

(11) In the ascription of the Kingdom, glory and power to God, some have fancied pantheism, although the Kingdom implies a personal ruler, and power and glory are certainly consistent with theism. But what if an all-pervading God-consciousness like that of Spinoza toward a being too great to submit to the limitations involved in personality, but in whom we live, move, and have our being, does work in the background? We ought to understand by this time that no deeply religious soul can possibly escape the undertow of this great current. God is all. Everything in the world is in a sense a mode, form, speaking-tube, or *per-sona* of him, and the ultimate reason of all the foregoing desiderata is found in the grand old Oriental refrain that God is all and in all, and that apocatastasis is the final cause of creation. At any rate, it helps us to know that if experience, philosophy, science, or the right attitude to poetry, force us to choose between personality and something higher than it rather than lower, we can fall back on assents as old as the Mana doctrine, and feel that we rest in everlasting arms, and that if our bark of system sinks it is to a vaster sea. All modern studies of the ego show that it is not simple, but

infinitely complex, at best a kind of vinculum containing various quantities, both known and unknown, carried on together through the whole equation of life for convenience, till each element receives its final evaluation. The elements of human selfhood are loosely wrought together and easily break up as in the phenomena of dual or multiple personality, while our truest self is below the threshold of consciousness, and therefore of unknown value, so that consciousness can never serve as a pattern of absolute existence. Indeed, all recent studies of prayer seem to show that the basal motivation of it is unification with the deeper unconscious elements of the soul, and back of these, with the orientation to the background of the universe itself.[1]

[1] A. L. Strong: "Relation of the Subconscious to Prayer," *Am. J. Relig. Psychol.*, 1906-07, vol. 2, p. 160-167. J.B Pratt: "An Empirical Study of Prayer." *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, pp. 48-67, 1911. Stephen W. Ransom: "Studies in the Psychology of Prayer." *Ibid.*, 1904. Vol. 1, pp. 129-142. F. O. Beck: "Prayer, a Study in Its History and Psychology." *Ibid.*, 1906, Vol. 2, pp. 107-121.

CHAPTER NINE

THE PARABLES OF JESUS

The following is the classification of Jülicher, the chief contemporary authority on the parables, whose rubrics are followed in this chapter:

A. Comparison parables: 1. The budding fig-tree as a herald of spring. 2. Constant slaves to duty without thanks. 3. Piping and dancing children. 4. A son asking a fish and getting a scorpion. 5. The disciple and pupil not above the teacher. 6. The blind leader of the blind. 7. What goes out of and not what enters the body defiles. 8. The salt of the earth. 9. The light on a candlestick. 10. The city on a hill. 11. The revealing of the concealed. 12. The eye as the light of the body. 13. Serving two masters impossible. 14. The tree known by its fruits. 15. A scribe instructed in the Kingdom. 16. The carcass-gathering eagles. 17. The watch set if we know when the thief is coming. 18. The faithful and unfaithful servant. 19. Receiving the head of the household late. 20. "Physician, heal thyself." 21. The sick and not the well need a physician. 22. No fasting when the bridegroom is present. 23. No new patch on an old garment, or new wine in old bottles. 24. Counting the cost of war or a tower. 25. Satan's kingdom divided against itself. 26. Agree with an enemy quickly for fear of judge and prison. 27. Take the lowest seat. 28. Children and dogs eat crumbs.

B. True parables: 29. The house on the rock or sand. 30. The neighbour importuned arises and gives food. 31. The widow and the unjust judge. 32. The usurer and the two debtors. 33. The pitiless servant. 34. The lost sheep and penny. 35. The prodigal son. 36. The brother who promised, and the brother who went. 37. The defiant tenant of the vineyard. 38. The declining guests to a feast. 39. The barren fig-tree. 40. The ten virgins. 41. Equal pay for the eleventh-hour man. 42. The loaned-out talents. 43. The unjust householder. 44. The sower on different kinds of ground. 45. Seed growing independently. 46. Tares and wheat. 47. The fish-net. 48. The mustard seed and leaven. 49. The treasure and the pearl of great price.

C. Illustrative narratives: 50. The good Samaritan. 51. The Pharisee and the publican. 52. The foolish rich man. 53. The rich man and poor Lazarus.

THE parables are probably the best transmitted and most authentic of all the teachings of Jesus, of which in Mark they constitute about one fourth, and in Matthew and Luke still more. Some of them are masterpieces of effective popular impartation. Jülicher,[1] who has given the most detailed study yet made, distinguishes three historic types of their hermeneutics. In the first period everything was allegorized. In the parable, e. g., of the prodigal son, the father's property squandered by the son stands for heathendom, the swine are demons, the robe is the state of Adam which was lost at the fall, the fatted calf is the body of the Lord broken at the eucharist, etc. Every item and idea is interpreted by itself with no reference whatever to unity, and there is no allusion to the customs of Jesus' age and land, as if these could contribute nothing to the eternal verities here dealt with, just as sometimes in a charade or a riddle every word and phrase precisely as it stands is significant. In the second period, from Origen (A. D. 254) to Luther, only essentials were allegorized. Each parable was taken as a whole and taught its own distinct lesson, and to this the occasion on which it was uttered is often the key. They illustrated Jesus' condescension to the level of folk-thought. In the third period, extending to the present, nothing is allegorized. Weiss goes so far as to say that Jesus was not striving for heuristic clearness, but was promulgating laws of the Kingdom of heaven. Their higher meaning must be intuited. They are the acme of self-luminosity, and to explain is to obscure them. Each is best conceived as a command. All belong together as more or less distinct specifications concerning the central theme of the Kingdom. While old and new methods of interpretation are still found, the old allegorization is on the wane.

Parables fall readily into four groups.[2] (1) Simple comparisons whereby one statement is made more objective by another: as, e. g., the budding fig-tree as a sign of summer, or whereas a servant who is ordered to do as he is told, receives no thanks (Luke xvii: 7-10), so every man must serve the Lord. Jesus had a genius for such illustrations. (2) Narratives or storiettes not unlike fables. These are numerous, e. g., the sower, the woman and the unjust judge, the usurer and his debtor, the lost penny, the lost sheep, the prodigal son, the

[1] "Die Gleichnisreden Jesu." Leipzig, 1899. Bd. 1, 328 p.; Bd. 2, 643 p.
[2] P. Staude: "Die Bedeutung der Gleichnisreden Jesu in unserer Zeit." Langensalza, 1903, 18 p.

unfruitful vineyard, the barren fig-tree, the ten virgins, the unwilling guests, equal reward for unequal work, the talents, the unjust householder. (3) A third class contains neither comparisons nor parables in the strict sense. Here belong the rich man and Lazarus, the pitiful Samaritan, the foolish rich man, the Pharisee and the publican. These are not strictly parables, because the story does not run in another domain, but the incident is rather an example illustrating a general principle. (4) The fourth class is peculiar to John, and is best illustrated in the pericope of the good shepherd. Such a complex of analogous statements is an allegory, always hovering in a half light in which we do not compare but substitute terms, without which the meaning is not clearly seen.

Jesus taught in parables, not, as the synoptists seem to have thought, in order to obscure, but rather to clarify his meaning. They tell us not only much incidentally about the local and temporal conditions of Jesus' life, but suggest that during his prepublic years in his solitary musings he had come to symbolize much in his physical and social environment by investing their items with higher meanings so that the parables give us glimpses of how in his own marvellous, if primitive, method of growth all things had come to speak to him of something above themselves. They give us perhaps the best of all examples of how the human soul works its way on to truth in a prelogical stage, when imagination and intuition are everything and logical concatenation has not begun its work of coördinating and harmonizing insights in different directions. If Jesus was, however, no mere poet or mystic on the one hand, nor on the other a man, with his intuitive insights utterly unconstellated, they did nevertheless converge toward one practical goal—the Kingdom, of which both the incidents of his experience and his intuitions had become so eloquent in his own soul. Apt, too, and well motivated as the parables generally are to the occasion on which they were enunciated, they could hardly have been *ad hoc* extemporizations.

They have also been grouped into chronological cycles according to topics, fulness of details, lucidity or obscurity, etc. Some have such verisimilitude that they have been thought to be actual events utilized for illustrative purposes, and most are so natural that they might have occurred at almost any time or place. As the chief theme of the miracles is the new life, so that of the parables is the Kingdom, what it is,

how it comes, who enters, how, etc. They are of various degrees of homiletic value, and the meaning of some is so obvious as to be almost commonplace, while others are cryptic and very diversely understood. They often overlap or teach almost identical lessons, or show only slight differences of aspect or relation in their themes; while it is baffling if not impossible to harmonize others, either with one another or with other utterances of Jesus on the same topic. They are the best-known and most portable of all his teachings, and some have furnished favourite themes to art.

Although a few occur in ancient Hebrew literature, canonical and other, parables are in a large measure Jesus' unique creation. His method was not that of the dialogue or of dialectic, for he rarely discussed or reasoned, nor did he ever show Socratic irony by evoking callow opinions on the part of his hearers and then gradually leading them on toward his own view by showing contradictions in theirs. He was not a midwife but an impregnator, handing down truth to be accepted intuitively and lived out, not argued about or debated. The parables show how to his mind the facts of nature and the events of human life were not merely what they seem but were transfigured, transparent, translucent, supercharged by meanings behind and above them. "A primrose by a river's brim" was not to him, as it was to Peter Bell, nothing but a yellow primrose; but rather like the "flower in the crannied wall," which really to know was to know what God and man are. If it can be said at all that the phenomenal world was to Jesus only an appearance, it is not in the metaphysical sense of revealing the transcendent noumenal entity, but as being essentially only types and symbols of moral values, and so ancillary to these that they would shortly be sloughed off and pass away to give place to a new heaven and earth when the day of righteousness came. On the other hand, the fact that the Great Parable-maker could find so much in the moral and social order of his day and time that spoke so clearly of the Kingdom suggests that though many would change or pass, many, and perhaps more, would abide when it came.

Most Protestant literature on the parables in English (Trench, Bruce, Dodds, Lang, Kirk, Taylor, Thompson, Maturin, Hubbard, Arnot, and many more) is chiefly for edification. Unless we except Trench, it is on the low level of scholarship that is content to compare parallel passages and versions in the New Testament, less often ex-

tending to the Old; very rarely attempting to extract meanings from the original language, and almost never with allusions to passages in the texts of other religions. Save in Trench we rarely find allusions to patristic interpretation, which is a rich and suggestive, if often picturesque, field. Thus Jülicher, with his vaster learning, rarely finds in English anything he deems worthy of citation. Yet from it all we can best realize how deeply embedded in the imaginal thought, and still more in the sentiment, of popular Christian experience are the personages and incidents. Like a magnet each of the leading parables has drawn about itself all the mass of meanings within the sphere of its attraction till it might be compared to a special complex or constellation, so that a large part of the moral life is interpreted in its terms. In this sense the art of the parables has become more real than history. The habit of extracting manifold meanings from them has also done much to predispose Christian scholarship and thought to interpret the record of historic events in the same symbolic way, as Farrar's "History of Interpretation" abundantly shows. While insisting on their historicity, events are regarded as also carrying one or perhaps a whole sheaf of higher messages, and facts are endlessly allegorized. In the vast body of comments on the parables, of which the above are illustrations, we find a surprising rarity of their application to daily secular duty; they are far more often brought home to vaguer hovering religious experiences. There is not so much withdrawal from pressing business and social reality as failure to reach it with the directness and force with which the inculcations of parables might be driven home to the very core of modern individual life; which raises the question whether the pulpit has actually used them without reservation, because they really touch the most vital matters of life and mind.

The new Tübingen school, culminating, so far as the parables are concerned, in Volkmar and Loman, think that everything, not only in the Apostolic Age but later, was coloured or motivated by three rival tendencies or parties—Paulinism, Judaism, and Petrinism. The last, while more or less mediating between these extreme views, is strongly anti-Pauline. In this school, from Baur down, the first thing to be determined of any New Testament writer is his attitude to Paul, the Johannin current only being more or less independent. Even Renan, who to some degree escapes this tendency, thinks that the seven chief parables of the Kingdom reflect later ideas. The parable, e. g., of the

eleventh-hour workman who received the same pay as those who had wrought all day, refers to Paul, and therefore underwent a redaction, and so did all the sayings to the effect that the last shall be first. These jealousies, especially between Paul and the disciples, represented by Peter, are thought to have strongly motivated all early writings till, later, in the interests of the Church, the traces of this old antagonism were carefully scored away.[1] Volkmar seems to think that we owe to partisan and controversial motives the very impulse to write Gospels and epistles and that the first effort of the critic now should be to know each author's tendency or bias, so that to some degree we can predict what he would select from the floating body of tradition, what he would omit, what he would bring into the foreground, what he would keep in the background, and even what he would be likely to invent or poetize. But the many variations of details in the different writers, together with the essential identity of content, can only mean genuineness and a common source, which must go back to Jesus. Æsop's fables were not recorded for centuries after his death, and in very different renderings; but they, too, show amid petty variations identity of content.

The word "parable" occurs fifty times in the New Testament, all times in the synoptists; although, subtracting parallels, it occurs but thirty. All represent Jesus as having a predilection for using this rhetorical form. Mark uses the word thirteen times for six different narratives; Matthew, seventeen times for twelve; Luke, eighteen times, seventeen of which are for the same parables as are recorded by Matthew and Mark. This "comparison" or "example" way of teaching may obscure or enlighten. The one train of thought or description is obvious, but the other is in more or less need of rebus-wise interpretation. Parables challenge the hearer to find the higher parallel meaning. They are thus in a sense Binet tests of spiritual insight, as to see a joke is a test of humour. To see only their literal meaning suggests the naïveté of childhood, even more than does the tendency to take miracles literally. Thus for genetic religious psychology they serve as mōron-finders. A parable is a patent, postulating a latent meaning, always requiring some psychoanalysis, as does a dream. It does not merely involve a parallelism of happenings in two domains, as Jülicher thinks (*Op. cit.* Bd. 1, S. 80), but the lower is given to find the higher, as a

[1] See an account of this movement in my "Founders of Modern Psychology." 1912, p. 6-19.

fable is a story the framework of which supports a higher significance. Both in a sense particularize some general truths, and in both, as well as in constructing allegory, analogy, symbol, simile, etc., there must be much *Rücksicht auf Darstellbarkeit.* The synoptists called them "dark sayings" because, and when, they did not understand them. Perhaps some of them showed Jesus' own tentative efforts to bring the truth he sought more clearly to his mind, or to grasp it better, so that they might not have been all primarily pedagogic. Some of them seem to have been the results of sudden intuition. It has been said that, effective as they were, the masses were not convinced, or else they would never have cried "Crucify him." In Mark the parables constitute a quarter or more of all Jesus' words, and in Luke nearly half of all he said from his first public appearance to his arrest, but we can hardly say that this tendency grew. At least, John records not one true parable.

In the parables we see farthest into Jesus' own heart. The chief of them pertain to the Kingdom, and without them we should have comparatively little knowledge of how he regarded it. For the first thousand years the Church looked on them as essentially for edification and explanation, and refused to admit their teachings into the body of theology. This idea of parable hermeneutics which forbade their use in argument conceived their appeal to be to the heart and will rather than to the reason. Now, however, we have a parabolic theology, very much debated to be sure, but which has come in with the recognition that the parables are the most genuine and the best transmitted of all the teachings of Jesus. In them many think we have his personality and his higher theanthropic consciousness; but we must not go too far in this direction, for in the parables Jesus speaks far more of the Father than of himself. There is little Paulinism and no allusion to the vicarious atonement. Here Jesus' sense of his Divine Sonship is not developed into a sense of his divinity. The salvation that he teaches is entirely independent of his death. The Kingdom is already at hand and open, not because Jesus is trusted by the Father as about to offer himself as a ransom for sin on the cross, but because the dear Father cannot refuse to answer prayer. In other words, Jesus is here teaching not a saviour but salvation; not he himself but history later made him a saviour. (See Jülicher, Bd. 1, S. 152 *et seq.*) Thus he was a redeemer before he died, and indeed we may add he would have

been so in a sense had he not died. His self-feeling in the parables, to be sure, gives him a place in the Kingdom. He evolved laws of the Kingdom, one after another, from his own self-consciousness, and while he felt himself stronger than Satan and conceived himself as a Messiah, his concern is almost entirely with his work and not with himself. If we knew their chronological order it might shed light upon the evolution of his ideas, but the synoptists differ very widely in this respect, and as they present the parables in so many degrees of fulness, it is doubtful whether we can ever find their genetic sequence. The common Christian conception is that they represent the same level of consciousness, without traces of developmental stages. All of them together are not in themselves sufficient to serve as a basis for an entire system of theology, important as they are for Jesus' pedagogy and psychology. Most, even critics, panegyrize them as models, although they can hardly be called works of art. His was a rather dark age of Hebrew literature; at least it was far below the prophetic age, and the parables by no means equal the prophecies in form. Moreover, Jesus had higher than aesthetic ends in view. In respect to form it is absurd to compare them, as many have done, with Homer, Sophocles, Isaiah, Habakkuk, Dante, or Shakespeare, or to call them the "greatest poetry in the world." They lie rather more in the domain of oratory than in that of poetry. Compared to the above classic authors Jesus is as Æsop to the ornate La Fontaine. Jesus' thought is of the highly imaginal type, as Goethe said his own was. This instinct to compare *similia similibus* was for him an expression of idealism. The very homeliness of the parables constitutes much of their charm, and perhaps still more of their effectiveness. If there are traces of exaggeration, yet there is no caricature. The size of the tree that grew from a grain of mustard seed, the ten thousand talents, the extreme unwillingness of the invited guests, the one hour which the belated labourers served instead of two hours in a somewhat similar Buddhistic legend, the extreme joy at finding the lost penny, the severity of some penalties —these may perhaps be a little Oriental but are hardly intemperate. The treachery of the householder, the conscienceless judge, the business shrewdness of the man who found the pearl of great price, were not censured, and this Renan has thought significant, but Jesus' gallery of characters and the repertory of acts had to contain both good and bad.

The chief attack on the parables has been that they were not original with Jesus. The early Church regarded most of the Old Testament as parable and subordinated its historicity to its meaning. Some of Jesus' parables, like the "good shepherd" and the vineyard, seem amplified from Old Testament metaphors. If we look to the apocrypha or pseudepigraphy, and especially to the Talmud, *midrash*, and cabalistic writings, as has often been done since Lightfoot (d. 1675), we learn that many Christian and Jewish writers have unearthed from these sources not a few more-or-less remote analogues to the parables of Jesus, and extremists have almost derived the New Testament from rabbinical literature. Wetstein (1751 f.), Noack (1839), Van Koetsveld (1858), Muscoviter (1882), A. Wünsche, Havet, and others have stressed the haggadah as the nurse of Jesus' mind and teaching. It has always been a problem to ascertain how much of this voluminous literature Jesus knew. Scholars find a few rabbinical storiettes with a moral that suggest some of the parables of Jesus. To illustrate: A king singled out one of his many labourers who was well-favoured and who distinguished himself by industry and skill, and he walked and talked with him openly. All the employees were paid the same wage at the end of the day, and the rest murmured that this new favourite who had wrought but two hours was given the same wage as those who had worked all day. But they were told by the king that the favoured one had done as much in two hours as they had done all day. So in another tale a genius died young, and it was said that, because he had accomplished as much in the few years he had lived as most did by the end of a long life, God called him to his reward. But in general the spirit, frame, theme, and lesson of Jesus' parables are very different. If the Talmudic tales were commonly known, of course Jesus without being taught them might have caught suggestions from them. Just how far his parables were a *de novo* creation perhaps we shall never know, but that his merit is impaired by these rival claims there is little reason to believe. He surely drew less from such extra-canonical sources than he did from the Old Testament, and whatever came from the former or from current tradition was probably no less transformed and transfigured.

Renan, Havet, Seydel, and many others who have since followed in their wake, think that Jesus' parables were influenced by Buddhistic literature by some mysterious way of infiltration. Buddha's life and

that of Christ are very often paralleled and their teachings compared. Oldenberg thinks that these two lives are variants of the great epos of religious founders. There is some similarity, e. g., between John's tale of the cure of the man born blind and a Buddhistic story, although in John the incident is reported as a miracle, not as a parable. The Buddhistic canon was practically closed before Jesus' day, but there was very much apocryphal elaboration afterward. Max Müller finds what he calls a striking coincidence between a pre-Christian Indic tale and that of the prodigal son, and there are many other items that suggest some relation, although the student of comparative religion knows how often legendary matter may be cast in similar moulds by different races independently of one another. The Evangelists certainly show no traces of Buddhistic influence, and the problem as to Jesus is not unlike that as to whether Pythagoras profited by the culture of Egypt. The Buddhist tales vacillate between thought and imagery, fable and allegory. They are far more rank in fancy, and so much longer that their prolixity sometimes makes them almost unreadable by Occidentals. They often abound in extreme exaggeration. The phrenologist Gall postulated a special parable faculty which he thought located in the brain just back of the upper frontal skull, near the middle of the forehead. This absurdity might be compared with that of certain apologists who assert for Jesus an entirely unique faculty which created and alone could use true parables, and who resent all rival claims as if they were infringements of patent. Jesus' parables are at least a species if not a genus by themselves, while if he drew from Indic sources, this not only does not lessen his inventiveness but gives a most useful hint to missionary pedagogy in India. Buddha lived five centuries B. C., and his cult was well established and widespread when Jesus was born; but despite the oft-traced analogies between the two men and their cults, the differences between both their lives and their doctrines are so great as to make them largely incommensurate. Moreover, the Hebrew mind was especially impervious to such influences. We can but wish that Jesus knew and freely drew from all the above sources; and if either accident or jealous design has robbed us of the evidence that he really knew in a broad comparative way and borrowed freely where it served his purpose, it would indeed be a great misfortune. If the author of Shakespeare had the knowledge of Bacon would it not really enhance his originality that,

with all the impedimenta of knowledge, his mind selected from the wide field the richest material and used it so freely and creatively? Certainly Shakespeare's lustre is not dimmed by the fact that he drew much of the material of his plays from the various older *Quellen* that Simrock has so convincingly shown to be his point of departure.

Let us turn now to the parables themselves.

A. COMPARISON PARABLES

1. After Jesus had vividly described the dreadful events attending the second coming of the Son, his disciples asked him privately by what sign they could foreknow these events. The answer, Matt. xxiv:32; Mark xiii:24-8; Luke xxi:29-31, called a parable, was that as when a fig-tree puts forth tender shoots we know summer is nigh, so when these calamities begin to occur, the Kingdom is at hand. As buds presage spring, calamities presage the millennium.

This equation of relations halts; for while the Kingdom is like spring, how can we call calamities its buds, when one is evolution and the other revolution? Though a thrice-recorded riddle it is as if Jesus, when asked to expound it, turned away from his awful picture of judgment to a milder mood, or else meant to say reassuringly to the disciples, "For you these calamities are not meant, but the new era will steal over you like gentle spring"; or else he meant to fortify them against disaster by saying that to them these horrors would have no terror, but only be signs of joy.

2. Luke (xvii:7-10) makes Jesus ask: Who will say to his servant coming in from ploughing, "Go and eat?" He will rather say, "Prepare and serve me, and when I have eaten and drunk, then you may do so." Is a servant thanked for thus doing? I trow not. So when you have done all that you are told to do, say: "We are unprofitable servants and have only done that which it was our duty to do."

Thus Jülicher thinks the disciples are told that they must be the slaves of God, not serving under a contract and unable not only to accumulate a store of desert but even to merit thanks. Supererogation therefore would be impossible. Subordination must be complete. This illustrates what Nietzsche calls the *Sklavenmorale* taught by Jesus and dear to slave-holders from whom not even thanks are ever due. The surrender of will must be complete. Some think this a Pauline

interpolation (because it is so much out of touch with its context), expressing the doctrine so stressed by Paul that our own righteousness is as filthy rags, an idea dear to Luther and to Calvin, while the self-righteousness of the Pharisees brings out the opposite standpoint by contrast. The teaching of this passage is absolute subjection and submission. It suggests Schleiermacher's feeling of absolute dependence and self-evacuation. We must be not merely the Lord's henchmen but his fags and factotums.

3. This generation (Matt. xi:16-19; Luke vii:31-35) is like children in the market calling to their mates, "We piped and ye did not dance, we mourned and ye did not weep"; for John ate no bread and drank no wine but was called a devil, while I do both and am called a glutton, wine-bibber, and friend of publican and sinner. Wisdom is justified of her children.

In both accounts the previous talk is of John, but the after-context differs so that the historic place of the incident is disputed. Exegetes of this illustration of Jesus have differed extremely. Cyril opines that the children were playing alternately wedding and funeral games, expressed by dancing and mourning, to two kinds of music, and this he infers rather from archaeological and antiquarian studies than from the fact that such games are favourite plays to-day. Part of the children, he assumes, at a certain stage of the game refused to play and were chided by the rest, which would be a very typical incident in plays and games to-day. John is funereal with a pessimistic message, says Holtzmann in substance, while Jesus represents an optimistic, marriage-like rôle. Both games were balked by the powers that be, so that the leader of one game was called a devil and that of the other a glutton. Jülicher says the moral is against *Kritikasterthum*, and the piping and mourning are the still small voice of the Spirit to which men are unresponsive. Thus wisdom is scorned. On the other hand, Jesus and John are made to accuse their hearers of not dancing to their music, playing their game, or justifying their wisdom. The moral implication is that no one can please those predisposed to censure, who will always find some pretext to pervert or find fault, and that no course of life or conduct can suit constitutional recalcitrants or those predisposed to negativism, who set their *noluntas* against the *voluntas* of others in a way which is in some sense the opposite of the servile submission taught in the preceding parable. As for Aristotle temperance was the golden mean between the two excesses of mortification of the body and Epicurean license, so the Christian life must justify itself by a wisdom equally distinct from excesses on either side. So, too, in social intercourse the

true way to fulness of life is not to hold entirely aloof from outcast classes like publicans or harlots, nor to consort with them as if we were of them. Use but not abuse all the goods of life, eschew alike intemperate temperance and abandoned license, and ignore the demands and fashions of a generation that has lost the true middle way. Look with appreciation sympathetic enough to be intelligent on all the rich *comédie humaine.* Taste every joy of life that can be felt with innocence. Be in thought, word, and deed just as full-blown and humanized as possible. Exploit and experience the whole life of man in all its modes, tenses, lights and shadows, forms and fashions, as far as individual limitations permit, regardless of the childish theories that would regulate and prescribe our conduct, using only the all-saving wisdom that is justified of her children. See the world, feel all its fulness, enter into all its moods, and expand personality as nearly as possible to the utmost limits of the race, provided we keep well within the orbit our nature marks out, equally mindful of the two poles of excess and defect. Do not dance to the infantile piping of those who prescribe a regimen in which either pleasure or pain unduly predominates. Be neither optimist nor pessimist, but rather both. Between the truth in all creeds do not conform to one to the exclusion of others and leave out the sound precepts of all faiths, parties, classes, practices. Follow all religions that have any core of righteousness, and avoid a life of prescription, for life is green, and theory old and gray. This parable seems a very crude exhortation to common sense in the conduct of life. There is often more philosophy in regulating health and moods than in many-volumed systems.

4. Again (Matt. vii:9-11; Luke xi:11-13), What father, if his son ask bread, will give him a stone, or if he ask for a fish will give him a serpent; or, Luke adds, if he ask an egg will he give him a scorpion? Thus, if you being evil know how to give fit gifts to your children, how much better does the heavenly Father know how to give fit gifts (Luke says give the Holy Spirit) to those that ask him? Just before, Jesus had been saying, "Ask and it will be given, knock and it will be opened, seek and ye shall find." Matthew adds next, "All things therefore whatsoever you would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets."

Bread loaves, we are told, then looked like stones, and hence the two became favourite terms of contrast; while fish, which became the type symbol of Christianity, is the diametrical opposite of the serpent, the symbol of the devil; and the egg, too, means fecundity, while the

scorpion stands for destruction. Thus it is predicating little of a father's love to say that he will not answer a request by giving the very opposite of what is asked for. This injunction to ask, knock, seek, has been perhaps more faithfully followed than any other scriptural behest. "O Lord, give me something: wealth, health, safety, success, victory, food, raiment, salvation," is the core of nearly all petitional prayer. Every wish of the human soul has taken the form of a request to heaven. The degree to which Christianity here has taken Jesus at his word and accepted his invitation to ask favours has often become nothing less than spiritual begging for what men should get for themselves. Indeed, this mendicant chapter constitutes one of the saddest in religious pathology. "You shall have whatever you ask" suggests the *carte-blanche* promise of a friendly despot to a favourite, or a gift of a magic wishing-cap. Indeed, it has been even condemned as a charlatan's bid for adherents. It contains, however, the saving implication that petitions may not be answered in kind, and that those who pray will not be given things bad for them. Luke safeguards the unconditioned promise by intimating that those who pray will receive the Holy Ghost, or what they ask for in its spiritual symbolic form. Thus the promised satisfaction of the uttered desire is qualified by God's fatherly discretion. Every wish breathed heavenward will bring some response from on high, or at least is reinforced by being expressed, so that its utterance marks a step toward its fulfilment. If we know what we want, if we try to get it, and if it is good for us, we shall get it.

5. "The disciple is not above his master nor the servant above his lord" (Matt. x:24 f.; Luke vi: 40). It is enough that the former be as the latter. Luke adds that every man that is perfect shall be as his master. If the master be called Beelzebub, all the more will the disciples have to bear this opprobrious epithet. The pupil does not stand higher than his teacher. It is enough if he equals him. All who are perfect should be teachers.

This parable bears on the jealousy of the disciples for precedence, but it tells us clearly in its gnomic way and in a spirit later illustrated in the "*Imitatio Christi*" and earlier in the instinct of subordination taught by the Stoic Epictetus, how domineering Jesus was both by nature and by necessity, and how authoritative he regarded his office as teacher. When enemies insult, the master must bear most, but his followers will have to endure their share of abuse.

The possible allusions or "improvements" in this pedagogic complex are so many that one wonders, as so often, whether Jesus himself saw all that was involved or was led to it by his genius, which was wiser

than he knew. It teaches at the same time docility, obedience, the need of perfection in the teacher, the duty of all who have attained it to teach and to rule. It warns against conceit, prepares the soul of his followers for opprobrium, inculcates the duty of every subordinate to equal if possible whoever is over him, but not to excite his enmity and indignation by surpassing him. At least all these meanings have been extracted out of or read into the passage. Did Jesus intend all this *multum in parvo;* and was it meant to teach all these lessons, or to stress some one or more of them?

6. "If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch" (Matt. xv:14; Luke vi:39). Cïcero, Plutarch, Philo, and many in modern times, have used this concise and expressive phrase. Matthew premises, "Every plant which my heavenly father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind." In both Gospels this sentence is more or less isolated and out of place. It is also anti-Pharisaic.

Leadership in thought and in action must be competent, or leader and led will come to grief. This is a sound common-sense precept illustrated in every sphere of life, but it is here given a very realistic and almost comic metaphor and shows Jesus' talent for graphic figurative phrase-making.

7. Calling all the people, he said, "Hear and understand (Matt. xv:10-20; Mark vii:14-23); not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the mouth, this defileth a man." And then he adds impressively (Mark), "If any man have ears to hear, let him hear." When asked by Peter or the disciples to explain, he said, Do you not see that what enters into the mouth does not go to the heart but to the belly and is cast out at the draught? But out of the heart come evil thoughts, murder, adultery, theft, covetousness, blasphemy, the evil eye, pride, folly, and false witness, etc. These defile, and not what we eat; nor, he adds (alluding to the Pharisees who were displeased at this saying), does, it defile to eat with unwashed hands.

A unique setting is given this saying by the fact that Jesus appears almost to convoke his audience like a town crier, enjoins them to make their very best effort at comprehension, as if something very cryptic and significant were coming, and then lays down a general principle

in a single sentence and is done. It suggests some new discovery. It is a kind of challenge to the understanding, a little as if it were a riddle or dream which each must work out the meaning of as best he can for himself. It implies, too, a glint of physiological knowledge, always so significant for any kind of psychology, here of the digestive tract and the phenomena of defecation, and also a deep insight into the psychology of the feelings and impulses. It is a thrust at the distinction so sacred to the Jews between clean and unclean or tabooed viands, and it causes the resentment of the Pharisees, because it implies that anything nutritive may be eaten without pollution. The really impure things are sins, all of which, like virtue, spring from the heart, the *fons et origo* of all that is really bad or good because it is the centre of the life of the soul. Thus the mouth is the excremental organ of thought, feelings, will, and desires, which spring from the heart. To make the contrast complete only the evil that escapes through the higher function of the mouth in speech, which is superposed upon its primal function of eating, should be included. Yet deeds proceed from the heart no less really than do words. To adduce our modern conception of food that is full of toxic products or morbific germs which do defile would be to go beyond the scope of the parable, although the Levitical sumptuary prescriptions here abrogated are thought to have been originally based on hygiene. Neither sacramental nor common food makes clean or unclean, but language, which reveals the soul's purity or vileness. Evil speech is worse than food ceremonially unclean. The contagion of crime is mostly oral. The utterances of a vile soul in speech are a veritable sewer against the defilement of which every safeguard is inadequate. The foul mouth corrupts and the effect of its utterance is true pollution. Moral hygiene demands the repression of all utterance of evil; for repression is to vice as oxygen to smouldering fire, which dies if it is withheld. Elsewhere bad thoughts are condemned, but here giving them language. We have two voluminous collections of popular obscenities published by groups of anthropologists respectively in Germany and France, and their precept is that, if sin were robbed of its rank vocabulary, its sting if not drawn would be at least blunted. This is sound psychological ethics and emphasizes an important item in the regimen of virtue.

The esoteric explanation of this parable, or fragment of a parable, as some think it, is plain enough. Assuming the soul to be clean, nothing external working inward can pollute it. What really degrades is efferent and has its chief seat in ejective tracts. This chimes very well with the theory of the efferent nature of all psychic activity, and here for the ethics of the present and the future is opened a rich quarry not yet adequately worked. We have a new criterion of value that

pragmatic morality should amplify, an apperception centre, a vital node of contemporary pragmatism.

8. Salt is good (Matt. v:13; Mark ix:49; Luke xiv:34), but if the salt becomes stale with what can it be seasoned? It is not fit for land or the dunghill; it is good only to be trodden under foot. Matthew makes Jesus call the disciples the salt of the earth. He tells them to have salt in themselves, and says they shall be salted with fire as the sacrifice is with salt.

Salt here is a conservative factor rather than an appetizer, and so is in fact in little danger of losing its savour as is implied. E. Jones[1] has taken great pains to prove that salt in folk-lore has a predominant sexual significance, but we think vainly, and there is certainly no such meaning here. Nor does this metaphor contemplate the destructive action of too much salt upon animal and vegetable life. It is a chemical which the systems of animals and men need and which they so crave that they accept many substitutes and often migrate far to get it. A small, quite constant percentage of it is as essential for the health of living, as it is preservative of dead, bodies. To be called "the salt of the earth" is one of the highest proverbial commendations, and this is in Jesus' sense. Salt keeps the sea fresh, and this trope implies that but for Christianity the world would putrefy. But we must not forget that a parable or simile pushed too far loses its savour. The context suggests that if the disciples lose their power of renunciation, they are degraded from a noble, precious, preservative element to dirt and mud underfoot. Christianity gives life a new zest as salt appetizes food.

9. A candle (Matt. v:14 f.; Mark iv:21 f.; Luke viii:17, and xi:33) is not put under a bushel or a bed, or in a secret place, but on a candlestick, that all may see; so your light must shine that men may see your good works and glorify the Father. You are the light of the world.

Thus the disciples are told that they practically cure from blindness all who see by their light. To a world lying in darkness they repeat the marvel of the creation of light. The admonition is against the luxury of mere self-illumination. There must be no secret cults of truth. No repression of it must be suffered, but it must be given promulgation and insights must be imparted. Preaching and teaching of the very best that is in them must be with abandon, utterly without reservations from prudential or any other motives. Christianity must

[1] "Die Bedeutung des Salz in Sitte und Brauch der Völker." *Imago*, 1912. Bd. 1, S. 361-85; 454-88.

mean *Aufklärung, éclaircissement,* as indeed it always has brought enlightenment, and kindled the torch of culture and science, and banished spiritual darkness. Who put their light under a bushel? Those who have intuitions or convictions which they conceal; those who kindle and feed the flame of truth in esoteric circles; those who refuse to promulgate their best and deepest thought, whether from some fear of *odium theologicum* or current orthodoxy, or diffidence of their own powers, or sluggishness; or those who seek to monopolize like a trade secret, and to use as if it were a burglar's dark lantern, the knowledge that others have a right to.

Those who refuse to patent, but give freely to the public their inventions and discoveries and refuse all monopolies of information are observing this precept.

10. "A city set on a hill cannot be hid" (Matt. v:14).

According to the early allegorizing interpretation, the city is the celestial city of the saints; the mountain upon the solid rocky basis of which it rests is Christ; the citizens are Church members; the towers, prophets; the doors, the apostles; the walls, the priests and teachers. Pure air, solidity, elevation above all that is mundane, and all manner of symbolisms which have been woven about mountain and city, have been spun about this passage. Some think that we have here an apocryphal prophecy of Zion's rule of the world; others, that it means that the light of truth in Christianity cannot be hidden but will inevitably be preached; but most commentators think it refers to the way in which good deeds shine far in a naughty world. Jesus tells his followers that they are conspicuous and observed, as well as that they live on the altitudes of human experience. The Kingdom is a mountain city, such as in a figurative sense was the heavenly Jerusalem, and such as the Roman Church was thought to be on earth. Certain it is that this parable, simple as it is, need not and should not always have one unitary and consistent explanation, but was meant to be a centre from which irradiate many lessons not necessarily consistent with one another.

11. There is nothing hidden which shall not be revealed and nothing secret that shall not be manifest. Then follows, What I tell you in darkness or privately, that speak in the light or from the housetop (Matt. x: 26 f.; Mark iv: 22; Luke viii: 17, and xi: 35 f.).

This is a Hebrew gnome. The esoteric shall be made exoteric. Some think it has an anti-gnostic purport. All riddles and parables will be explained. There must be no cloistered or concealed knowl-

edge. Some think it means that faith will attain sight. The heart will bear its fruit. Things secretly guarded in the breast will come out. Bushels will be taken off all candles, not to satisfy prying curiosity but by a law of diffusion and popularization of true science. Here once rested the dogma of the perspicacity of the Scriptures, on which so much exegesis is an unconscious satire. But this passage is futuristic and prophetic, suggesting the indefinite progress of knowledge. Perhaps here Jesus withdraws or cancels all his injunctions to tell no man. Whatever opposition it encounters the glad Gospel tidings must be proclaimed with no reservations and no vestige of timidity. Not only God sees, but all the world will and must.

12. The light of the body is the eye (Matt. vi: 22 f.; Luke xi: 34, and xxxii: 6). If the eye is right, the body is full of light, but if it is bad, of darkness. No part of the body must be dark. The light in us must not be darkness, which is great if it is a darkness made out of light.

This is one of the most difficult of all Jesus' sayings, and voluminous and divergent have been the interpretations of it. Liberal commentators think it shows a muddled knowledge of optics and represents views that are utterly antiquated. Jülicher, after epitomizing many other views, concludes that it is "an admonition to care faithfully for that which is as indispensable for the spiritual as the eye is for the corporeal life," and thinks its purport akin to that of the parable of the salt of the earth which had lost its savour. He seems to think that Jesus regarded the eye for the purpose of illuminating the whole body, so that any defect involved obscurity in some part of the body—a view nowhere found in antiquity, and as false as the very widespread and persistent view, till Harvey, that air entered the lungs and through them the arteries (air passages), and thence pervaded the whole body. Even if Jesus anticipated the modern experiments which show that retinal stimuli tone up all the bodily functions and accelerate every physiological process, while binding or extirpating the eyes puts many animals to sleep, this might help. Was he groping toward something he did not fully comprehend? Does it suggest, like many other of his sayings, a proclivity toward physiological psychology on Jesus' part, crude and ignorant but rightly oriented in the very direction in which that important science has recently developed? May we psychoanalyze some of the parables, and throwing history and criticism to the winds, read modern meanings into them? If so, possibly we have here a prelusive adumbration of Wundt's chief contribution to psychology, viz., that optical perception is the key to apperception, and that in the

distinction between *Blickpunkt* and *Blickfeld* we find an open door to the comprehension of the direct and indirect field of consciousness, so that the mind is in a sense made largely on the pattern of the eye, and this sense is the best analogue of its mode of action. We must not forget that in many passages Jesus used seeing symbolically, and that the new insights he brought into the world were conveyed to us under the analogy of restoring sight to the blind. At least he means that ignorance leaves the soul in darkness as optical opacity leaves the body inert and without the power of self-direction. The symbolization of light through all the ages has been too complex to be exhaustively treated. Until this is done this passage will have to remain one of the "dark sayings."

13. No one, or no servant, can serve two masters (Matt. vi: 24 f., Luke xvi: 13). One will be loved and cleaved to and the other hated and despised. Thus no one can serve God and Mammon, the god of ill-gotten wealth.

This reminds us, of course, of the treasure laid up in heaven and the camel in the needle's eye. It seems a popular proverb utilized for Jesus' present purpose. Some expositors assume that the two masters are hostile, which would make the task of serving them both more difficult. The slave cannot possibly be indifferent and so far as he is inclined to prefer one master he will grow averse to the other. But there should be no duplicity, no vacillating policy, no hypocrisy or reservations. Service should be complete and single. The claims of the two masters are not only divergent but contradictory. There might conceivably be alternation, serving of now one and now the other master, like doing the will of God on Sunday and serving Mammon the other days of the week. We must have one supreme goal in life, and not two or more, which would be worse yet. If one master were served in a way and at a time displeasing to the other, the neglected master would, of course, be incensed. Thus life, as in the preceding verse we are told the eye, must be single.

14. Men, like trees, are known by their fruits. Good men bear good, bad men bear evil fruit (Matt. vii: 16-20; Luke vi: 43-6). A good tree cannot bear bad, nor a corrupt tree good, fruit.

This is connected with the warning against false prophets in sheep's clothing who are inwardly ravening wolves. Luke adds that men do not gather figs of thorns or grapes of thistles. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart brings forth that which is good,

an evil man that which is evil; for the mouth speaks out of the abundance of the heart. Unfruitfulness is a sure sign of false piety and doctrine, and this is valid of false prophets.

This seems like modern pragmatism. Good works are the best indications of sound doctrine, and every error produces bad conduct. A wolf clothed with a sheep's skin is like thistles bearing figs, and both are impostors or hypocrites. A really good heart cannot produce bad deeds. Acts speak louder than words. As each plant breeds true to its species, so the good or the bad man lives out his life according to his inmost nature. Fruit there must be, yet the warning against false prophets implies that men may seem but not be good, although to true discernment each is sure to betray himself. A morbid complex, evil or good desires, inevitably find a vent, and all disguise and pretense are ineffective to prevent it. Only in a double life, which is against nature, is it possible for thorns to bear grapes.

15. Every scribe instructed in the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xiii: 52) is like a householder bringing forth from his treasure things new and old.

This comes at the close of a long pericope of parables, and after Jesus had asked the disciples if they had understood and they had answered. This seems to say that a Jew who understands Jesus' teaching of the Kingdom, and, as did the disciples, combines a knowledge of the Old Testament and the new message of Jesus, is like one who brings forth from a richly furnished family store-room what is most needful for each member of the household. There is always the implication that the old must not be forgotten for the new, as neologists are prone to do. Köstlin thinks Jesus here is recommending to the disciples his own mode of teaching by parables, which combines the recondite and the familiar. Would that we could think he meant to commend the genetic method that understands the new only in the light of the old and *vice versa* in the sense of modern evolution! This would be putting new wine into old bottles, which he is reported on authority that some have challenged to have said elsewhere no man does. Yet in the limited sense that stands for the most striking of all religious evolutions, viz., that of the New Testament developing out of the Old, in which it lay concealed, Jesus was *facile princeps* of cultural evolutionism. If we can only be progressive and at the same time conservative, or even as a member of either party recognize the necessary function of the other, we shall be strong. To be devotees of the past or of the future is, like all extreme positions, easiest but least effective. Paul perhaps was the best of all illustrations of this parablette, being well trained in the learning of the scribes and also a Christian.

16. Where the carcass is there the eagles gather (Matt. xxiv: 28; Luke xvii: 37).

In Luke this is said in answer to the question apropos of Jesus' statement that two will be in one bed, two grinding together, two in the field, and one will be taken and the other left. In Matthew it appears in the midst of a description of the advent of the last day. It is one of the most current proverbial, if somewhat repulsive and difficult, of the parables, brief as it is. The terrible side of the *parousia* will appear wherever there is an object of judgment, Jewish or heathen. Sin draws a penalty as carrion does birds of prey. It can hardly mean, as has been said, that the Messiah will as surely find his own as vultures find a carcass, or that retribution will overtake those dead and rotten with sin, or that Satan is the eagle preying upon his victim. Why not take it in the double sense, viz., that virtue will as surely find its reward and sin its penalty as a mouldering dead body will draw to it all those creatures that naturally feed upon it? Iniquity draws social and physical convulsions. Vengeance is waiting like birds of prey. The Hebrew mind was peculiarly prone, if disaster came, to interpret it as a punishment for sin and to search its own heart for the real cause. Jesus here says: "Given these calamities that I have described, and you can be as certain that there is a commensurate sin as you are when you see a flock of carrion birds gathering that there is a carcass somewhere attracting them."

17. If a good householder knows when a thief is coming he will watch and prevent the burglary (Matt. xxiv: 43; Luke xii: 39). The context both before and after in both Gospels is: Be ready for the coming of the Son of Man, who will arrive stealthily as a housebreaker. Here the time, as in the preceding parable the place, is stressed. The injunction is: Watch, for you know not the day or the hour, so that this is another *semper paratus* warning. The *parousia* will come when it is least expected.

Many expositors make the householder deaf, some refer to Holbein's stealthy dance of approach, while others think the thief is the devil, always striving to outwit and pilfer away souls. But if we watch we prevent the theft. Believers welcome the coming of the Son who gives rather than takes away from them. The advent, too, will be soon, although it is undatable, and no one must be caught napping. Not only is the time short, but it will probably secretly be set at just that time when most will be off their guard. Thus the disciples have the double advantage of knowing this and also knowing that

it will come soon. He who takes your soul will seek to surprise you, and you must strive to prevent him from taking you unawares. *Memento semper mori.* Never for an instant forget that you must die, and may die at any time. Always have preparations complete. Thanatophobia, which has inspired medicine, hygiene, and even the conceptions of another life, has indeed been a great muse, and here we are enjoined to live as if every day, hour, and minute would be our last. Or does it all concern the coming of another order of things in this world without death? With the indeterminate characterization of other parables is it meant to have multifarious suggestiveness?

18. Blessed is the faithful and wise servant whom his lord made ruler over his household (Matt. xxiv: 45-51; Luke xii: 41-48), and who gives to all their meat in due season, and is found so doing when the lord comes. He will be made ruler of all. But if because the lord delays his coming he smites his fellows and becomes drunken and gluttonous, to him the lord will come when least expected, will cut him asunder and send him among hypocrites where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. Luke adds that the servant that knows his lord's will and does it not shall be beaten with many stripes, but he who knows it not shall receive but few stripes, for to whom much is given of him will much be required.

Here the admonition is to the virtue of loyalty in the large sense of Royce and the Japanese. Personal fealty and at the same time fidelity to a trust are commended, and also by implication fiduciary responsibility and duty done independently of supervision. There is a saving gradation of demerit because those who do not know are beaten less than those who violate their trust after being duly instructed in it. All are servants, representatives, with only delegated power, or at best vicegerents holding and administering what is committed to them in trust for a feudal lord. Heavy indeed will be the penalty for those found false. As time goes by those who are not true will begin to act, not as vicariates or attendants, but as owners, and will abuse their power, as other parables show; but that is just the moment the absentee landlord will select to arrive. Good stewardship with few specific instructions, tenancy with an indeterminate lease, and utter loyalty to the employer, though he be an absentee, are required on pain of cruel and barbaric torture.

Had, then, Jesus no trust in his followers or in human nature, that he felt it needful so often to hold out rewards and utter threats of direst punishment? Had he so little faith in men that he could

not depend upon their fidelity to him and had to make the strongest appeal he could possibly devise to fear and hope? The Stoic made virtue its own reward and vice its own penalty, but in Jesus' sayings there are very few traces of this. Even in the beatitudes each trait commended is given a prize. All are paid or penalized in natural or spiritual coin. Save only in Parable Two, there is no glint of a service of love alone; but rather that of servile duty is enjoined. Is it not as if virtue and happiness, sin and misery, did not intrinsically belong together, but must be brought together by an extraneous sovereign will, without whose intervention they would rarely and only fortuitously find each other? There is much in Jesus' sayings that almost seems to anticipate the modern doctrine of temibility, or the principle that a certain degree of pain, measurable for each individual and for each sin, would be an adequate deterrent.

19. Keep your loins girded and your lights burning (Mark xiii: 33-37; Luke xii: 35-38). Wait like servants, ready to open on the instant when the master, coming home from a wedding, knocks. Such servants he will make sit down at his table, and will gird himself and serve them. Blessed are they who are found thus waiting, at whatever watch of the night the lord comes. In Mark the lord had gone on a journey, having assigned to each servant his duty and having charged the porter to watch his return. He will come suddenly, and must not find any one sleeping. All must watch. He must not be kept waiting, or knock a second time.

Godet says that the lord is supposed to have come home so sated from a wedding feast that he cared not himself to partake of the meal the servants had ready for him, and as a reward for their promptness and punctuality divided it among and served it to them, in the same spirit of humility as Jesus washed his disciples' feet. Thus in the Roman saturnalia the master became servant and the servant master. Thus Jesus served the viands at his Last Supper. The coming of the Lord, some think, refers to the *parousia*, others to the hour of death as it comes to the individual. Some see in it an exhortation to die fully conscious and thus to receive the Lord. If the *parousia* is meant, it is also implied that it may be delayed longer than was expected. But the Lord will surely come again, and it will be in judgment, and of this great assize all the faithful must be ever mindful. No one knows the hour, not even the Son, but it will be by night when most sleep. Hence the old charge to be always ready, expectant, attentive, with lamps lighted and with sufficient oil in them, to observe

keenly the signs of the great advent, listen for the knock at the door, and open immediately; be ever alert, watchful, waiting all through the night for the great home-coming.

20. Jesus quotes the proverb, "Physician, heal thyself" (Luke iv: 23), after he had charmed the attendance at the synagogue at Nazareth, had been identified as Joseph's son, and had been asked but was declining to do miracles here as he was said to have done in Capernaum, because no prophet is accepted in his own country.

"Physician, heal thyself" is the shortest of the parables, but it is set in an illuminating pericope. If he did no miracles here he would be like a physician that could not heal himself. His repute at his boyhood home waned when he was recognized, and he was invited to heal his reputation by a miracle done on the spot. Otherwise he would be like a doctor smitten by the disease he had made it his specialty to prevent and cure. The call to show what he could do here has suggested to some the taunt on the cross, Thou that doest mighty things, save thyself and come down from the cross. Plato thought a physician must have experience with illness in his own person to be sympathetic and efficient with his patients; but we are not told that Jesus was ever ill, not even amidst his greatest trials. Those about to be executed must sometimes be carried, but he carried his own cross. If we look at his life as a whole, he did perhaps save his repute as a healer of souls by doing what were thought to be miracles of bodily healing. Luke's form of statement suggests imperfect comprehension on his part.

21. They that are whole (Matt. ix: 12; Mark ii: 17; Luke v: 21 f.) need not a physician, but they that are sick. Jesus says that he was come to call not the righteous but sinners to repentance. Matthew adds an injunction to learn the meaning of the phrase, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice." Luke gives this saying in answer to the question why (at Levi's feast) Jesus and his disciples ate with publicans and sinners.

Here Jesus appears as a moral psychiatrist associating with those whom rigorists thought depraved and so held aloof from. His attitude is not that of modern social workers who say they are studying conditions to devise ethical and hygienic reform, although he could hardly help doing this; but he is rather comparing himself to a doctor visiting quarantine quarters to help his patients. Missionary work has only

lately taken on again a largely medicinal and hygienic character. The early Church gradually abandoned its healing function when the old psychotherapy with which it began was discredited. Thus this parable proverb has new significance to-day. This, however, is not the core of meaning. It is more akin to that of the lost sheep and the prodigal. Those whom his questioners thought righteous he felt were in peculiar need of salvation, so this saying is rather a retort or confutation in justification of his latitudinarianism. Perhaps it shows how he regarded the power of conversion as later exemplified in Paul and Augustine, and in the case of the devotion of Mary Magdalene, so often before him. Thus he doubtless realized that those who had gone wrong and been set right were the most active elements in the new life; for there is a point of view from which it is better to have sinned and been rescued than never to have sinned at all, as Kierkegaard has shown. At any rate, this sketch brings out the contrast between the native, naïve Parsifal innocence and impeccable virtue, illustrated by Jesus himself, and those snatched like brands from the burning, and implies that he, unlike his interrogators, did not need to be so careful of the company he kept, because he was in less danger of being infected or tempted than they. His work of mercy was more pleasing to God than were sacrifices. His attitude is corrective compassion to those whom narrow legalism had outlawed. Sinners like those of this feast to whom exception was taken were interesting "cases," patients he yearned to save, and he would not be kept or called away from them.

22. The disciples of John and the Pharisees were wont to fast (Mark ii: 18-20; Matt. ix: 14 f.; Luke v: 23-25). When Jesus is asked why his disciples do not do so he replies that they have the bridegroom with them, but that the time for them to fast will be when he is taken away.

In this debate Pharisaic purism adduces the Baptist's example against Jesus' more liberal views of the conduct of life. He sees the device that might involve an issue between himself and John's followers but avoids it, urging that those within are celebrating high festival so long as he is with them, and that this is no time for legalism, funereal mourning, or ascetism. Fasting is out of place in the presence of the Lord of life. Stern Ebionitic pietism would be an anachronism now. A temperate euphoric abandon is in order. A bridegroom ought to be the happiest of men, and should irradiate joy. Here again we have the ecstatic motive. The soul just wedded to Jesus is transcendentally joyful, as the objective studies of those newly wedded to Jesus in Starbuck, James, Leuba, and others show. Fasting has its

important place and function in medicine, religion, physiology, and hygiene; but very likely had the Baptist himself been present and fully understood that Jesus was in very deed the Messiah whom he heralded, he would have cast off his abstemiousness and realized the double joy that folklore and custom have always assigned to banquets and to weddings. Exhilaration, elation, elevation, and euphoria of soul, anticipating the moods of the heavenly marriage-supper with the Lamb, are here sanctioned.

23. No one sews new cloth on an old garment, for this makes the rent worse (Matt. ix: 16 f.; Mark ii: 21 f.; Luke v: 36-39). Luke adds that the new piece does not match the old. No one puts new wine into old bottles lest the bottles break and the wine be spilled and the bottles spoiled, but new wine must go into new bottles and then both are preserved.

This parable has had a very checkered history. The old bottles and old garment have been interpreted as the Pharisees' cleaving to the old, as all under the old covenant, as the disciples of the Baptist, as Jesus' weak and callow disciples, and as old institutions, views and customs generally, while the new cloth and wine have been thought to mean the new joy and freedom Jesus brought, the new covenant and doctrine, the ecstatic state of mind brought by the Gospels, aggressive policies, new institutions, discoveries, etc. Many writers think both comparisons relate fundamentally to the relations between the New and the Old Testament, or the new life of Christ and the old one of sin while some think all relations between the old and the new in every domain of life are here alluded to. Many find here an admonition to break with the old, and come out. Reformers should not consort with but cut away from the old, as Paul did, and as he would abrogate the law. The passage is generally thought to be out of place in Mark, and some regard it as a fragment of a larger but lost discourse of Jesus. This impression that we are dealing with older fragments patch-worked together without regard for matching, which Luke alone refers to, is often felt. But the gravamen here is in the contrast between the old and the new, and it shows Jesus as a catastrophist rather than as a uniformitarian. He was temperamentally disposed toward breaks, crises, epochs. He would have had more sympathy, if we can judge by this passage alone, with the French revolution, that swept all that was old away and organized everything anew, than with the English way of making history, where everything widens on from precedent to precedent, and so much of the old is conserved in the new and so much of the new is cast into the forms of the old. The parable is so anti-

evolutionary, too, that some have hoped it was not authentic. The Catholic Church in absorbing the barbarians of early Europe achieved its greatest successes by putting new meanings into old forms, and changing and adapting, rather than throwing away, most that it found at hand. The same principle applies to the successful Protestant minister, to the pedagogue, and to reformers generally. Do not all leaders do just what Jesus here says no one does? How many are now engaged in putting new wine and meaning into the old bottles of Christianity, and thus conserving both at the same time? Even conversion may come as gradually as growth, and be dateless.

24. Who, intending to build a house, does not sit down and count the cost to see if he has enough to finish it, lest having laid the foundation, observers mock and say, "Here was one who began to build but was not able to finish" (Luke xiv: 28-33)? Or what king, going to war, does not first sit down and consider whether with ten thousand he will meet an enemy with twenty thousand troops, and then have to beg terms of peace? Whoso does not forsake all cannot be my disciple.

This is a paradigm of ordinary economic world wisdom applied to the Kingdom which it costs so much to enter. Do not join the Church, take any vow, as of a monk or nun, swear any fraternity or sodality oath that you have not fully realized the obligations of and estimated your moral ability to keep, etc. The motive for the prudence here adduced is fear of ridicule. It has a pregnant sense for promoters of enterprises, and its need is seen in failures in business (more than ten thousand a year in this country), in organizations, societies, etc., for all varieties of good purposes. Confucius repeatedly gave the same admonition in other terms. Jesus felt it, for he had counted the cost of his own perilous career, perhaps was doing so throughout the temptations of the desert. His modern enemies, and, indeed, some of his friends, like Renan, think he made a fatal error in his calculations of what he could and could not carry through, and lost his life because he attempted too much. This is also one theme in the modern efficiency movement. Every dictionary of proverbs, too, shows that all people have popular sayings to this effect, and not only is prudence in this respect rated high, but failure to count the cost brings misfortunes that are the chief theme of satire and ridicule. To begin only what we can finish is a kind of everyday, Ben Franklin-, Tupper-like, proverbial philosophy, desperate though the enterprise here typified is. It means abandonment to a love so intense that family love is hate beside it, just as ice itself is hot compared to the lowest

artificial temperature of thousands of degrees that physics is now able to produce.

Few intellects can compute in advance all the cost involved in choosing such a course, and this characteristic utterance of Jesus is well calculated to warn all men of ordinary mettle from attempting to lead his life. Its intrinsic difficulty makes it seem superhuman; for the context in the light of which this parable is to be interpreted is that no man can become a full disciple who does not forsake all, hate father, mother, wife, children, brethren, and even his own life, and bear the cross. We had better not try if we are not confident of the power to finish. If the head is weak, or the eye, or the heart fails, miscarriage is inevitable, sooner or later. The natural affections must actually be martyred. Thus Jesus certainly cannot be said to cajole, wheedle, or seduce. The hardihood of accepting his call would seem to require less intellect than what the world calls fanaticism. Nor does the context comport with a moral injunction to love all men, even our enemies; but here again we must recognize Jesus' tropical and perfervid nature, which scorns qualification, comparison, or balancing modulated statements. For these his heart was too hot, his mind too sharply focussed on the single point in hand, and so he often fails to consider the relations of what he says to other truths, trusting the deeper unity of his own soul rather than relying on the superficial unity of doctrine or logic.

25. When the scribes said he had Beelzebub and cast out devils by the prince of devils (Mark iii: 22-27; Matt. xii: 24-30; Luke xi: 14-26), Jesus answered by a parable, viz., how can Satan cast out Satan? A kingdom or a house divided against itself cannot stand. If Satan rise up against Satan he is divided and hath an end, and he adds that in order to spoil a strong man he must first be found. All sin will be forgiven save only blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, but such a sin can never be, but he who commits it is in jeopardy of eternal damnation. (This because they accused him of having an unclean spirit.) Luke makes Jesus ask his accusers the counter-question: "By whom do your offspring cast out devils?" and say: "If I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the Kingdom of God is come upon you." In Luke he had just cast out a devil, and adds that a strong keeper of a palace can be overcome only by one stronger yet, who will then take away his armour, and divide his spoil, closing the incident in Matthew with, "Who is not with me is against me, and who gathereth not with me scattereth."

Here we are in a dualistic, Manichean world, conceived with Dantesque or Miltonic vividness. The good and the bad, light and dark, are represented by highly developed hierarchies, each with its supreme leader and a series of subordinates graded by ranks. Most, if not all, that happens in both the physical and the moral world are incidents of their incessant and relentless warfare. One of these incidents is that evil spirits often take possession of the souls of certain people. Many of these Jesus had ordered out, and they had obeyed him and fled away. Here the insidious and damning charge is that they obey his behest because he is their superior in command. He is the leader of their side, viz., very Satan himself, and they do not obey because they are evicted by a conquering leader of the hosts of goodness. Or, according to many primitive concepts, Jesus is here accused of using black and not white magic. If this is true, he is a demon of high degree, and not divine. He is Diabolus masquerading as a son of God, and is now detected. The issue is momentous, crucial, perhaps sudden, and the alternative perhaps the most extreme that could be conceived according to the ideas of the cosmos that then prevailed. Jesus' answer is that Satan would not order the withdrawal of his own forces. He wishes to possess, not to dispossess, men. To order him out of tenements his minions have conquered and occupied, and cling to so pertinaciously, would mean revolt, weakness, and eventual ruin. Satan would never order a retreat; for this would sow the seeds of dissension among his own subordinates, and thus his house would fall. The only explanation, therefore, of these cases of exorcism, is that Satan's emissaries are forced by a stronger hostile power to give up the ground they have won, although it jeopardizes the unity and integrity of his kingdom. Thus Jesus constrains Satan and is more potent than he, and the power of God comes very near whenever he does these acts. He asks his accusers by which of these two powers they cast out devils, suggesting that the same charge they had brought against him might be levelled against them with equal force. No half-way ground is possible, therefore. All must be for or against. It must be Yahveh or Satan, for here are the polar opposites of the moral world. Therefore, to reverse all things, to attribute the works of God to the devil, or *vice versa* to put him in God's place, is the greatest, most hopeless inversion of all values. It is the one and only unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost. It is, in short, blasphemy. Frank diabolism, it may be mentioned, has had many disciples and cults with sacrilegious rites such as the Witches' Sabbath in which the mysteries of Christianity have been parodied under the motto, "Evil, be thou my good." Satanism has had its own decade and school of literature in France (e. g., Huysmans' "Des Esseintes" and Baudelaire's "Les Fleurs du Mal," Stendhal's work, and some of the writings of the very

clever Paul Bourget, who says, "We do not want to be saved and deprived of the voluptuous pleasure of going to perdition." See also J. H. Leuba (*Am. Jour. Psychol.*, Vol. 5, pp. 496-539). Here, too, we might cite the pathetic history of the conceptions of the unpardonable sin and its effects on those who are thought to have committed it. But all this would take us too far afield. The very scholarly but finicking and jejune Jülicher laboriously extracts from this parable the lesson that "the expulsion of demons presupposes the advent of God's Kingdom." To us the lesson is eternal orientation as the condition of virtue in this world of moral dualism.

26. Agree with thine adversary promptly whiles thou art in the way with him (Matt. v: 25 f.; Luke xii: 58-59). Luke says, Give diligence to this matter lest your enemy bring you to the judge and he deliver you to the officers, and then you will be cast into prison. From this there will be no hope of escape till you have paid the uttermost mite or farthing.

This seems a precept of very ordinary but sound common sense, which is uncommon enough in fact. Appease all enemies promptly for the prudential reason that otherwise you may have to go to law and be caused greater trouble. Not only the nature but the history of this parable makes it a good illustration of what is often called the elasticity of the parables, and it might be stretched into a commendation of arbitration to prevent war, a utilitarian removal of all possible causes for quarrels in their bud in the interests of peaceableness, as a precept never to make enemies when it is possible to avoid doing so, because vengeance is an infection that rankles and tends to grow rapidly to dangerous proportions. "Agree" may mean any kind of appeasement, from apology and pardon-begging to placation by the extremest self-abasement. The implication is that those addressed are either weaker or less resentful or more conciliatory than their adversary, nor is it entirely inconsistent with Bacon's injunction to avoid entrance into a quarrel but being in, to comport oneself so that the enemy will beware of one. Here only one specific aspect of a very complex situation is singled out of how the true aristocrat of the Kingdom will act. Jesus' allusion to lawyers who tend to magnify disagreements is often suggested and perhaps also his distrust of Courts and of humanly administered justice.

27. Noting how they chose the chief rooms, Jesus said (Luke xiv: 7-14), When bidden to a wedding, do not sit in the highest place lest a

more honourable man come and be given your seat and you have to sit lower down. Rather choose the lowest place, and then the host may say to you, "Go up higher." Then the other guests will respect you for the honour they see done you. For whoso exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

Weddings greatly impressed the celibate Jesus, and he evolved from them many of his highest and most sublimated insights and impartations, and the same was true, perhaps, in even a higher degree, of eating and feasts. This parable is a part of the table-talk with a leading Pharisee. Jesus announced it as a parable, perhaps in a spirit of pleasant banter. Possibly he himself occupied the lowest place at table, and if so this would have made his utterance more impressive. It has been suggested that he had insisted on taking it, perhaps not so much with design in order to give point to an admonition which he planned to give, as to explain his humble place. Perhaps, too, the host had given an object lesson by changing the position of some of the guests, raising some and degrading others; for in ancient symposia, as we see in Plato, this was often an important though very delicate matter. If so, it was all stingingly apposite and personal, but the opportunity sharply to point and bring home a moral was too good to be lost, and this applies, even though it was Jesus' seat that was regarded as the head of the table.

This has a close parallel in one of the adages of Mencius, suggesting on its face merely the conduct proper for a true gentleman, so that it might stand in any book of good manners or etiquette. It would be foolish to take a seat on the platform if there was a chance of being asked to come down and make room for others there. There seems no superhuman wisdom here, but as if by some Swedenborgian correspondence between things earthly and things heavenly, it is made an apperceptive formula of insight into the next world. The merit that takes the lowest place is just that which deserves the highest. The immanent and the transcendental are complemental each to the other. The *Diesseits* and the *Jenseits* are not copies but counterparts, if not antitheses. Jesus humbled himself in his earthly life, and was later exalted. So the beatitudes are upon the weak, lowly, humble, poor in spirit. Heaven pays well, and abnegation here brings blessing beyond. Investment in the momentary obscurity of this life buys an eternity of glory. Mundane relations are only negatives of those found in the fairyland beyond. What we have there is measured by what we forego here. This may be a parable of asceticism to which the disguises of meanness became the chosen incognitos of good sense. This at least underlies the parable, and is a meaning that finds fuller outcrops in other teachings of Our Lord.

28. To a Greek woman who asked Jesus to cast out a devil from her daughter Jesus said (Mark vii: 27; Matt. xv: 26 f.): "Let the children first be filled for it is not meet to take the children's bread and to cast it unto the dogs." She replied: "Yes, Lord, yet the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs." Pleased at this, Jesus cast out the devil from her daughter (a cure at a distance). Matthew adds that at first Jesus answered her not till the disciples wanted to send her away, and then said that he was sent only to the lost sheep, especially to Israel.

Here Jesus is made to seem persuaded to make an exception to the rule of helping Hebrews, first by a deft, repartee-like plea of a gentile mother who bested him by turning his semiparable on her side and against him. Matthew adds that he commended her faith in believing that not a whole ration but only a crumb was sufficient for the cure. Let us hope, too, that although realizing as he must that he was outwitted and his own simile fairly turned against him, and that by a despised alien and woman, he capitulated gracefully and as a gentleman rather than, as some urge, because he was susceptible to the other sex, although there are elsewhere suggestions of this, as in Renan and several of the apocryphal writings.

The interpretation commonly stressed is that this marks a step toward universalism in the later Pauline sense, and that crumbs under the table are among the first suggestions of missionary work. It also contributed something to the miraculous efficiency afterward ascribed in Church legends to the crumbs of the sacrament, which as the body of Our Lord came to be cared for with such superstitious anxiety. Some think that it marks not only an early but the first stage in Jesus' mind of a realization that non-Israelites were to profit by his mission, and that the parable of outcasts taking the place of those first invited stands for a later and more developed conception by Jesus of the scope of his work. In the later parables, on this theory the dogs under come to be seated at the table, and the chief priests and the Jews of high degree are not present even as dogs under it. Jesus' race feeling was intense, and he was more or less caste-bound to the end. The "children" whom he wished to sit at the table were true orthodox Jews; but of his ideal of reaching them he was soon disillusioned, and so came to put his trust in and direct his effort toward the people or masses, who were chiefly represented on his board of disciples. In the above parable he perhaps first grasped the next step, viz., of directing efforts to the still wider circle of gentiles who later, in fact, came to constitute practically all of his followers, for Christianity offers the most complete case of an ethnically transplanted religion. If so,

then this nimble-minded unknown Greek mother marked an epoch in the psychogenesis of Christianity, and she would have been fitter than Thekla to be the heroine of the spurious Acts of Paul.

B. TRUE PARABLES

29. He who hears and does Jesus' precepts is like a man who builds a house on a rock, even if he has to dig down to it (Matt. vii: 24-7; Luke vi: 41-9). Then, when wind and storm beat on it, it stands firm. He who hears and does not, builds his house on earth and sand, and then, when flood and storm come, it falls and is a wreck.

This duplex parable is in Luke the epilogue or peroration or the sermon on the mount, and might well end every sermon. Its application is plain as day. Gnosis is good, for it builds, but the structure lacks durability. Willed action carried on to the point of habituation is the rock. This is the solid basis of human nature to which the mind trusts that builds for aye. It is character, not nativistic, but made as a result of precept. It is knowledge put into the form of will and deeds, which are the language of complete men and become transmissible by heredity as merely noetic attainments are not. Wind, flood, and rain are trials; and storm, and stress, and sand are good impulses and resolutions, not petrified into character. Jesus had a *penchant* for symbols of steadfastness and perdurability. Simon was surnamed Peter the Rock, or cornerstone of the Church. Heaven and earth will fail, but no item of his word. His followers must be steadfast and immovable. As a mason as well as a carpenter Jesus felt the force of such similitudes. The discourse of which this is the end consisted of precepts to live by, which were not intended to be mere enlighteners of the intellect. They were a philosophy to be embodied in life. To live by and according to these directions is to build on the solid Rock of Ages. The same might be said of industrial, and especially of engineering, activities. These must be based on sound scientific principles or come to naught, as thousands of them in this country do for this reason. Also, so far as we are artificers of our own fortunes, sound moral principles are the rock to build on, not merely to be known and assented to. Re-education cannot be securely accomplished without adding perspiration to aspiration. To respond to good inculcations only by the phosphorescent glow of answering good purposes or wishes is nothing but leaves, not fruit. If this parable was intended to be restricted to the sermon on the mount, it shows how fundamental Jesus considered that discourse. Few commentators think the storm or flood has any eschatological reference, although it harmonizes with the doctrine of the perseverance of the

saints. The world longs for certainty ineluctable, for some *aliquod inconcussum* which cannot be moved and on which the soul can stand securely. Kant compared truth to a rocky island set amidst tempestuous and foggy seas of doubt. Men have sought it in religion, philosophy, science. Here, says Jesus, it is, so far as needed as the basis for the moral conduct of life.

30. A man goes to his neighbour at midnight and asks for three loaves to set before a friend who has just unexpectedly arrived from a journey. The neighbour aroused from his slumber cries out from within, Trouble me not. The door is shut and I am abed with my children and cannot rise and serve you. Now although he would not rise because asked by a friend, he will arise and give him all he wants if sufficiently importuned. Therefore ask, seek, knock, and you will prevail (Luke xi: 5-10).

This anecdote is a *genre* picture of lowly life. A poor man has an unexpected, tired, and hungry guest at midnight, when, as Wendt and Weiss explain, bread shops are closed. His own larder is bare, so that he cannot perform the duties of hospitality, so imperative that Tiersch explains these gave the host's request a much stronger appeal than if he had asked for his own needs. Waking the friendly neighbour in the weary traveller's behalf, the former, inert with sleep, voices his reluctance to arise and disturb his children. The disturber of sleep, however, is not in the least rebuffed, discouraged, or fearful of arousing the resentment of his somnolent friend, and so persists in his request till his well-disposed but torpid friend rises and gives him all he asks. The moral is perseveration in proffering requests.

But is the good Lord the sleepy neighbour who must be awakened as the prophet of old exhorted the priests of Baal to cry louder and again lest their unresponsive god be sleeping or travelling? If so, he certainly does not here seem more anxious to give than his petitioners are to receive; nor is he in the rôle of one who never slumbers or sleeps. This reference seems to fall in the blind spot of Jesus' purpose here, while in the fovea is the injunction that the Lord will not feel that we are imposing on him or presuming too much upon his good will if we break in upon his slumbers and arouse him and his celestial household to give us for a needy guest. The host is, perhaps, less ashamed of his imprudence in being caught unprovided in the presence of his neighbour than he is before his guest. But hospitable instincts are also probably outside the scope of the parable. The crucial point is that believers should not in their prayers simply ask and, if they do not receive, withdraw with dignity or discouragement, nor should they do

so out of deference to the Lord's state or convenience, but should keep on urging their needs, and persevere in so doing till they are gratified. To pray and not receive is always a great and crucial trial to faith, especially that of young converts, and it is against the discouragement and possible unbelief of those whose requests are deferred or unanswered that Jesus here provides a safeguard for those who follow him, even though to do so he represents the All-Father in an all too human rôle. Elsewhere importunity is represented as overcoming indifference or disinclination on the Lord's part, but here he is first asleep, and then shows the inertness that follows sudden waking. Here inclination is not absent, but only torpid. Jesus seems inconsiderate of the way in which the Lord appears. He permits him to do so in a very undivine light, excessively anthropomorphized, because in so doing he can make pertinacity in intercession seem more necessary, and more hopeful. Better the heavenly Father be thought somnolent and lazy than have believers lose confidence in the answer to their prayer. Consider the Lord as human, only too human, but do not doubt that he is at heart well disposed to answer prayer. Thus Jesus, true pragmatist that he is, meets the great danger that men may fall away and grow faint-hearted by an astonishing sacrifice of the dignity and sublimity of the Lord. The interests of men are after all his great concern. Thus we have a profound and most illuminating glance into Jesus' true mind and will. His relation is primarily with man, and not, as older theology made out, with God.

31. In a parable which Luke says is to teach men always to pray without ceasing (xviii: 1-8), Jesus tells, as if it were a true incident, of a judge who feared neither God nor man, to whom a widow prayed to be avenged of her adversary. At first he turned a deaf ear, but later decided to avenge her lest by her continued importunity she weary him. If an unjust judge was thus spurred to do his duty, how much more will God avenge his own elect who cry to him day and night? Though he bear long, he will avenge them speedily. Shall the Son find faith on earth when he comes? The widow was deserted, in sorrow and need, and exposed to we know not what trials, persecutions, or temptations, from which a just judge would desire to free her. This judge had no love of justice and no sympathy with the victim of injustice, but granted her request at last, solely to be rid of her.

In the previous parable (30) of the sleeping householder aroused from slumber to give bread to a neighbour for a guest, previous acquaintance and good will are assumed, but here these are apparently

absent so that this parable intensifies still more the efficiency of importunity. A strong and reiterated wish tends to realize itself if the object to which it is addressed is in fact not an objective deity but our own deeper, larger, and more potent unconscious nature. This injunction thus seems good modern psychology. We have constantly to spur and incite our submerged self to wake it (as in 30), or as here to worry it into activity; for the conscious mind needs its help. We objectify our racial and unconscious nature from an inveterate habit of projective or ejective thought imposed upon us by sense experience. Hartmann's philosophy calls the unconscious not only omniscient and omnipotent but beneficent; and in these Freudian days we realize what a power it is in making us well or ill, strong or weak, happy or miserable. If it were permissible to interpret these two parables in this sense they would teach rather the relative impotence of consciousness which is a product of individual experience as compared with the vaster racial soul in each of us, and suggest that when invoking a mighty alien power to vouchsafe to us what we want, it is best done by fixation upon the object of our desire. The question, however, is best discussed in the general psychology of prayer.

Jesus in his healing works seems almost powerless to resist persistency. If our efforts to obtain the things we need are feeble, they ought to be unintermittent; for as trickling water wears away a rock, so unremitting effort will overcome every obstacle. When the sum of many little efforts reaches a constant total, the lever tips, and anon the powers that rule the depths of nature and the soul are found on our side, and they assuredly make for righteousness in the end and at bottom. The deepest and oldest things in us are the best organized, sanest and most normal, and so an appeal to them is often most efficacious.

32. A certain creditor (Luke only viii: 36-50) had two debtors, one who owed him five hundred and another who owed him fifty pence; and as neither could pay, he forgave the debt to both of them. Which, asked Jesus, would love that creditor most? They answered, He to whom most was forgiven; and this answer Jesus approved.

This parable is inseparable from its setting. Jesus was dining with a Pharisee when a sinful woman entered, who wept, washed his feet and wiped them with her hair, and anointed him from an alabaster box. The host thought that had he been a great prophet, he would have known that this woman was a great sinner, and therefore resented her attention. Jesus answering his thought responded that he had something to say, and when told to speak, gave this parable. Then pointing to the woman he said to the host, You gave me no water with

which to wash my feet, but she washed them with her tears and dried them with her hair. You gave me no kiss but she has continued to kiss my feet. You did not anoint my head, but she anointed my feet. Therefore her sins which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much. Those to whom little is forgiven love little. To the woman he said, Thy sins are forgiven. Thy faith hath saved thee. Go in peace; while the guests murmured, Who is this who forgives sins?

Altogether, this prose idyll in which the parable is set as an apt and illustrative anecdote has always been one of the most cherished incidents of Jesus' life, on which the Christian consciousness dwells with great fondness. Grace is most abounding to the greatest sinners. Those plucked as brands from the burning naturally love most. The pathos of forgiveness and gratitude is the dominant motive, and art has loved to give the whole a scenic setting. Nothing could be more lucid and unambiguous than the lesson it teaches. A fallen woman is not beyond the reach of salvation. To the Lord her sin is like a debt forgiven; and no wonder that the easy, spontaneous assumption of the power to forgive sin as a creditor might forgive a debt gives his fellow diners pause. Some think the woman is Mary Magdalene who thereafter followed Jesus with such touching fidelity and devotion. Her act is voluntary, abject, and self-humiliating, and an act not only of pathetic but of costly devotion.

This story contributes to one trait of vulgar converts, viz., ostentatiously magnifying the depth of the iniquity of their previous lives in order to impress others with a sense that they had had forgiveness to an exceptional degree, as if they had been objects of peculiar, divine favouritism, and therefore could love with greater fervour; so that it has often been asked whether it is not better to have sinned much, if only one is surely forgiven, than to have sinned little or not at all. This is a peculiar trait of the revival psychosis. But a debt, even if forgiven, is still in a sense due, and no power can truly forgive it. Pardon, too, is always relative and personal. An avenger may refuse to retaliate, but this is not all of forgiveness. Would a man of Stoic pride or of true honour consent to be rehabilitated or relieved from paying a price by an act of insolvency or taking a poor debtor's oath, or even having another pay a debt that he had incurred? The Nietzsche superman says, If I have deserved hell by my own life, it is hell that I want, for I could never be happy in heaven if I did not merit it in my own person. To think I can sin and evade its consequence by hiding behind the skirts of Jesus is not an invitation to sin, but to accept it is to abandon manliness, and only a craven soul can accept a salvation that is not his due. By this doctrine a man is sold not so much to sin as to priestcraft, and the sale of indulgences is inevitable. The only true redemption is to pay the penalty in full, and that also is

in fact what every sinner always did and must always do. In nature or psychology there is no such thing as a vicarious atonement. The soul that sins dies, and it was Paul, not Jesus, who taught anything at variance with this. Let us rather follow those who hold that in forgiving the sinful woman Jesus only meant that he would not condemn her, but saw saving goodness in her penitence. He sympathized with, trusted, and pardoned her, but had no thought of unlocking the door of heaven to her. Again, if Jesus is loved ten times as much by those he has forgiven ten times as much, then one great sinner's love is equal to that of ten who are forgiven little; while those who need no forgiveness, if such exist, would experience no love. But here comes in the law of compensation. If after leading a sinful life we are converted, we instinctively strive to atone for the past by doing supererogatory good enough to compensate for the badness of our previous life. What is this deep instinct but an impulse to work out our own salvation, to which we are impelled even though we have confessed and received absolution? In the Catholic confessional an ever larger part of the help which the penitent receives comes from the human sympathy and encouragement extended by the priest, and less can be ascribed to the sense that post-mortem penalties are removed, indefinitely helpful though this sense is to those who can still whole-heartedly believe it. Sin is unsocial, and its very act tends to isolation, which for gregarious man is always painful. Thus, to have a true friend take us by the hand, express confidence and good will, and act toward us as if we had never gone astray—this is the only forgiveness, and this alone may rescue. But of this elsewhere.

33. A king (Matt. xviii:21-35) took account of his servants. One owed him ten thousand talents, and as he had nothing to pay, it was ordered that he and his wife and children be sold to make good the debt. But the servant fell down, implored pardon, and promised to pay all, and thus he aroused the king's compassion so that he was forgiven all. This same servant went out and found a fellow servant who owed him one hundred pence, and seized him by the throat and demanded payment. His victim fell down, implored patience, and promised to pay all; but he was not heard, but cast into prison till all was paid. The king hearing of this summoned the servant, rebuked him, and asked why he had not exercised to his debtor the same pity that had been shown to him, and in anger gave him over to be tormented till the ten thousand talents were made good. Thus will the Lord do to you if you do not all from your very hearts forgive every one who trespasses against you. Forgive as you have been forgiven is the obvious moral.

We are again, as in the preceding parable, in the realm of debt and credit. Creditors in that day had almost unlimited power over their debtors and often used it flagrantly, requiring their full pound of flesh. Creditors were often also extortionate and usurers; hence this parable must have gone home. In a sense there is nothing specifically Christian here, and various parallels are found in the teachings of the Old Testament. In the context Peter had just asked how often if a brother sinned, he should be forgiven, and had been told seventy times seven, and then follows this parable. It is doubtful, however, if we have the true context here. At least the cruel servant is only forgiven once and then condemned beyond redemption, as if Jesus would place those guilty of such iniquity as this in as low a circle of the inferno as Dante did. The heinousness of the offence of the pitiless servant appears here set off by the damning fact that he had just been forgiven a vastly greater debt, so that his inhumanity to his own debtor mmediately afterward is so incredible that it has been variously explained. The reason we must forgive debts to the poor is not because they deserve it, or because it is good for us to do so, but because the dear Lord has forgiven us all a far greater debt. The servant was not forcibly collecting debts owed to him in order to pay what he owed the king, because this obligation had been cancelled. As he who gives to the poor lends to the Lord, so to forgive a debt to one unable to pay it is to pay our own debt to the Lord, and the natural impulse to remit a debt to others after a larger obligation which we have been ourselves under has been remitted shows the conduct of the servant in a very dark light by contrast. Modern society recognizes the principle here taught in its statutes of limitation of debts, and also in its bankruptcy laws.

Behind the debt and credit terms of the parable, however, lies a larger lesson of forgiving all kinds of trespasses as we have been forgiven them. Some commentators waste much ingenuity in discussing the significance of this largest sum of money, ten thousand talents, mentioned by Jesus, and think he uses it perhaps as a child uses millions as the highest number it knows, and thus it stands in Jesus' mind for the immeasurable debt all sinners owe. Others discuss the "tormentors," usually opining that they refer to the powers of hell. Others discuss the cause of the change of mood of the servant, who must have at first been greatly exalted and happy when he was forgiven, so that some special experience must be assumed to account for his apparently sudden change to cruelty. Some postulate that the remission he had experienced was given publicly, and that he was taunted by his co-servants with accepting a gratuity, or that he excited their envy by being an object of favouritism, and that this angered him. Still others think that after having laboured so long under a debt that

seemed to him hopeless, he was suddenly rid of it, and developed a new or revived an old but abandoned ambition, perhaps a strong childish wish, to become rich himself, which now became possible; and so he took this cruel way to attain his end. Still others think his black moral perversity only a fit image of man's treatment of the Lord, and imply that if he was morally insane so are all unregenerate men. It shows also the two personalities of the Lord, the loving and forgiving on the one hand, and the punitive and vengeful on the other, and how readily the one attitude passes over into the other.

Over against all such subtleties we must not forget that this, like most of the other parables, is a humble effort to teach homely, practical truths to the populace, and thus most scholastic efforts to explain it are nothing but sophistic pedantry that detracts rather than adds to its force. Mercy and compassion, tenderness and pity, could stand out in no stronger contrast than over against poverty and debt, so common and so pathetic in this age of Roman exaction, which had reduced to direst need so large a part of the population even in this very fertile land. All are debtors, and if under the law of justice God should foreclose, the best of us would be bankrupt and sold for debt; but he remits freely as he would have us do. Hegel's "Phenomenology" makes forgiveness the very essence of religion, marking its emergence from within as the soul's act of sovereign majesty, making the done as though it were undone. To repent is to alienate and estrange ourselves from our past—to cast it off as a nullity. Such is the vigour of our nature and the power of God that man can eject his baser self, as the cell extrudes the polar globules that it does not need. Thus we moult sin, even when it is well entrenched. Forgiveness, therefore, is a good measure of the stages of moral and religious life. Freedom to become bad involves the power to become good again. Penalty for ejected sin retards the magnificent stages of its expulsion from the soul, while pardon, if hearty and reiterated, accelerates them.[1] Perhaps confession as now understood by alienists has this strange therapeutic power. If the debt cancelled is great, the joy of its remission is also great.

34. Despise not these little ones (Matt. xviii:10-14) for their angels (or souls) always behold the Father's face. The Son came to save the lost. If a man have one hundred sheep and one go astray, he leaves the ninety and nine, seeking the lost one, and if he find it, he rejoices more in that one than in the ninety and nine that went not astray. The Lord does not wish one of these little ones to perish. Luke (xv:1-10) gives this parable a different setting. To publicans and sinners who drew near, and to the scribes and Pharisees who

[1] See my translation of Rosenkranz's "Hegel as the National Philosopher of Germany," p. 146.

murmured that Jesus received and ate with sinners, he gives this parable of the lost sheep. Here the shepherd returns with the sheep on his shoulder and calls his neighbours to rejoice with him because the lost is found. Matthew adds that there is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repents than over ninety and nine just men who need no repentance. Luke also adds the story of the woman losing one of her ten silver coins. She then lights a candle, sweeps and seeks till it is found, and then calls her friends to rejoice with her. So the angels rejoice most over sinners who repent. How much more is a man worth than a sheep or a piece of silver? The parent or teacher having a sick or even imbecile child cares more for it than for all the others who are normal, for need and helplessness increase love.

If this doctrine applies to degenerate man, it is anti-eugenic, for care is most worthily and most profitably for mankind bestowed on those who are best. But pity drew the Christian God from heaven to earth, and human as pity is, it tends to make the Church a hospital or asylum. Matthew's prelude concerning the little ones always beholding the Father's face suggests that the errant was loved more because, by repenting, he became again as a new-born child. To be lost cannot mean that the Divine One does not know where we are, but that we have escaped saving influences. Here the spirit that has made missionaries and slum workers is inculcated. The sinner is still God's property, and is loved as an individual. Reproached by his critics as he so often was for it, Jesus really loved sinners and publicans, whom the Pharisees held aloof from. Luke, the sympathetic physician, as we might expect gives this parable a somewhat higher colour. Cyril called the owner of the flock the Saviour. The lost sheep is Adam with all his posterity; the ninety and nine that stayed in the fold are the hosts of unfallen angels, vastly outnumbering man; the incarnation is the start in quest of the lost; the lost penny had God's image on it, although it was obscured by rust and dirt.

Would it not, in fact, be better shepherd-craft if one sheep were lost out of a flock of a hundred, for the shepherd to spend the time and energy here given to finding the strayed one to caring the better for the ninety and nine that remained, instead of leaving them uncared for while seeking the lost one, that might be found to have impaired value or to be dead in the wilderness? Yes, but for the infinite worth of each soul which is here implied. Could not the woman earn several pence with the same effort spent in finding the lost one? Yes; but there would have been one less coin in the realm to circulate. These and the next are parables of pity, and not of prudence.

35. The younger of two sons (Luke xv:11-32) asked his father to give him his part of the inheritance. He received it, journeyed afar, spent it all in rioting, and when a famine fell, had to herd swine and became so hungry that he longed for their food. And he reflected that even his father's servants had bread while he starved, and resolved within himself that he would go home to his father, to whom and to heaven he would confess his sin and plead that he was not worthy to be called his son, and beg for a servant's place. As he approached home, his father saw him afar, pitied, ran to meet, and kissed him, whereupon he confessed his sins and his unfitness to be called a son. But the father ordered the best robe, a ring, and shoes to be brought for him; killed a fatted calf, and held a feast because, as he said, "This my son was dead and is alive again; he was lost and is found." But as the elder son, who had been working in the field, drew near and heard of the festivities and was told what it all meant, he was wroth; and when the father invited him to enter and take part he would not, but said, I have served and obeyed you these many years, and you made no festival for me as you have done for your younger son who devoured his living with harlots. To him his father answered, Son, thou art always with me, and all that I have is thine, but it is fit that we should make merry; for thy brother who was dead is alive, was lost, is found.

This is the most comprehensive of all the parables, and was once called *evangelium in evangelio;* while Luther with his Pauline doctrine of justification by faith neglected, and many, indeed, have objected to, it as almost rewarding dissipation and vice. To most Christian teachers this has been one of the very dearest of all the parables. It has also been deemed theocratic. The older son has been called the Jews, the younger, the heathen. At one time the older represented angels, and the younger, men. There are two sides, if not indeed a real dualism, in all religions. This grievous sinner was freely forgiven without and before any atonement had been provided by Jesus' death. For this reason the parable is a stumbling block to those who make justification rest solely upon faith in Jesus' death and Resurrection. The prodigal in a sense saves himself. His spontaneous and internal regeneration is purely subjective, and is accepted by the father. Beyschlag says that his salvation, however, was unevangelical and unapostolic. In another sense we may say that not the Holy Spirit, but hunger and poverty, converted this lost son. We seem to have here a

contradiction of the motto, *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. There was perhaps some Oedipus-like, if unconscious, father-hatred which prompted the son's departure with his patrimony, and his home-coming may have been a compensating revulsion of feeling. But it all seems on his part a matter of calculation. He was "down and out," and preferred even a servant's place at home to the dire extremity in which he found himself. The father's forgiveness before any confession or expression of regret and his extreme joy at regaining his rakish son have seemed to some to smack of senility and infatuation. The older son's wrath, too, was perhaps not due to a natural sense of justice alone, for with this feeling we can all sympathize. Another mainspring of his conduct may have been a desire, perhaps unconscious, to be himself the object of such manifestations of love from his father as were lavished upon the renegade younger brother. Only infatuated wives welcome back their erring husbands so precipitately and unquestioningly. Does this parable in some sense place a premium upon sin, and discourage steadfast devotion to duty? Thus in this parable we have, as many have thought, the same dangerous lesson as in the preceding one of the lost sheep and the penny. On this doctrine a fallen angel, weary of hell and returning, would cause more rapture in heaven than a large company of unfallen saints. This parable has long been one of the favourite themes of art, of hymnology, and revivalism, and has been made the theme of romances and dramas galore because man pities his own estate. Of all the Evangelists Luke records most of these teachings, and tradition has said that he illustrated them in his life as a physician. It has often been hinted, but without good ground, that perhaps he had experienced salvation from great sin himself. He alone, too, records the parable of the good Samaritan to illustrate the love of neighbour as of self. The priest and the Levite passed by the stripped, robbed, and wounded man, but the Samaritan bound his wounds, after washing them with oil and wine, took him to an inn, and on leaving left money for his further care and promised to return. In all these cases there is special love of the disinherited, the sinful, the victims of wrong, those who have suffered social wreckage from their own or others' passion. To the chief of sinners grace most abounds. The graver the disease, the greater the cure, and the more affection would both physician and patient bear each other. Nothing better shows the power of Christianity than its rescue of desperate cases, and perhaps nothing so enlists Christian enthusiasm as this work. Christianity, above all other religions, is thus one of hope in the very teeth of despair. This is the true resurrection from death, and of this every other resurrection is only a symbol, or a parable crassified, it may be, into literal reality by the very weight of meaning it has to bear. The grave and hell yield up their prey to Jesus; but just as it is easier

and more truly divine to forgive sin than to heal the body, so to revive those dead in trespasses and sin is a mightier miracle than to reanimate a corpse.

How does this constellation of instances comport with the lesson of the parable of the sower? The down-trodden, the despised, whom Jesus would make special efforts to find and whom it gives peculiar rapture to save—are not those most apt to receive his teaching? If they were so, then, at least, it would seem that some of the disciples would have come from this class, and there is little indication that this was in fact the case with any one of them or of any other of his near and constant followers. None of them had been prodigals, lost sheep, or objects of any special work of rescue. It was not any of the special qualities engendered by such experience, such as Paul or Augustine had, that Jesus primarily sought for in his chosen apostolate. Quick as such cases are to learn, and eager as they may be to atone by zealous propaganda for their own past, they are not the best human material for laying the foundations of the Kingdom, serviceable though they may be in the later work of building or decorating, and Jesus knew or felt a very real difference between relatively unfallen and specially restored human nature. Reformed drunkards may conduct whirlwind campaigns for teetotalism; but they are not likely to be wise leaders of their great cause, and still less so to expound the philosophic doctrines of true temperance.

Perhaps a fitter title for this parable would be "A father's love." Some think this, and more think the parable of the unjust judge, may have referred to some real and notorious contemporary incident. But we are not told of the future of the prodigal, whether he became respected and powerful or soon died from the natural results of his debauchery, despite the parental forgiveness. On the other hand, we must not conceive the father as fatuously and senilely blinded by love to his son's sins. If we are here taught that the vilest sinner may return, and that the Father will not disown or disinherit, but welcome and lavish openly affection upon the penitent, we have surely a doctrine that may easily be abused. Nature's penalties are inevitable.

36. A man (Matt. xxi:28-32) had two sons, and he said to the first, "Son, go work to-day in my vineyard"; and the son replied, "I will not," but afterward repented and went. The second son given the same command, said "I go, sir," but went not. Which of these two sons, asks Jesus, did the father's will? His auditors replied with apparent unanimity, The first. And Jesus said, publicans and harlots will go into the Kingdom before you (for they are like the first son). They believed John and you did not. Luke (vii:29-30) adds that the

people and publicans heard John, but the Pharisees and lawyers rejected him.

Expositors have always treated this parable with the greatest reserve, because they have found it very embarrassing. There was, of course, but one answer to Jesus' question concerning childish obedience. The lesson is clear. Actions speak louder than words. To obey is of more consequence than to promise, resolve, or contract to do so. Those who make a pledge and then fail to keep it are worse than those who orally refuse to obey and then, on second thought, do so. True service is in deeds, and not by word of mouth. There is less harm in breaking a bad promise than a good one, although to promise and also to do is better yet.

37. A man (Mark xii:1-12) planted a vineyard, hedged it, provided storage for the wine, built a tower, let it out, and travelled to a far country. In due time a servant was sent to the husbandmen for rent, but he was beaten and sent away with nothing. Another servant was sent, who was stoned and wounded. A third sent on the same errand was killed, and later many others were sent who were either beaten or killed. At last the owner sent his favourite son, feeling that the tenants would surely respect him. They, however, conferred, reasoning that, as this was the heir, if they killed him the vineyard would be theirs. This they did and cast him out. What, therefore, will the lord and owner of the vineyard do? He will destroy these tenants and give the vineyard into other hands. Thus the stone rejected by the builders becomes the chief stone, for such are the marvellous things of the Lord. Those who heard this parable, knowing it was against them, sought to seize Jesus but feared the people and so left him. Matthew (xxi:33-36) adds to this narrative, God's kingdom will be taken from you and given to the nation bringing forth fruits. Whosoever falls on this stone will be broken, but he on whom it falls will be ground to powder. Luke (xx:9-19) also repeats the same parable with only slight differences of detail, this unique conformity indicating a common older source, adding only that when they were told that the vineyard would be given to others the people cried out, "God forbid."

The commonest and most frequent interpretation makes the vineyard God's Kingdom on earth. He himself is the absent owner; the Jewish hierarchy are the tenants; the servant-messengers, prophets;

the beloved son, Jesus; the new tenants, the gentile nations. On this view Jesus foretells his own death, the rejection of the Jews, and the conversion of the gentiles. It is God who, having established his own plantation, departs. The revolting, Messiah-murdering hierarchy who fear the people is here definitely rejected after a manifestation of extreme patience on the Lord's part and after repeated and cumulative provocations. The so-called theocracy, the chosen people, has proved a usurper. The promised land is not to be Jerusalem, and the people of the covenant have forfeited it. Israel, which thought itself the *élite* among nations, is proscribed, condemned, and executed. The antithesis some think a double one, viz., between the hierarchy and the common people, and also between the Jews and the heathen.

This proclamation is a *mene tekel upharsin* for those who have betrayed a sacred trust. The rejected stone (the Son) is reinstated and given the chief place as the Rock of Ages. The Son's murderer seems a *vaticinium ex eventu*, and so the authenticity of the parable has been challenged as a product of the theological thinking of the primitive Church instead of the definite proclamation of Jesus himself. Certainly the Jews never did or would say that Jesus was the heir, for this would be an acknowledgment of his Sonship, which they never made. He was not slain as God's heir. Liberal scholars, therefore, usually conceive that Jesus gave some parable concerning a vineyard, but that it was radically reconstructed later; and the very unanimity of the synoptists is thought suspicious, indicating an agreement on the part of the survivors of Jesus to give the fragment of tradition which is at the core of this parable a Pauline cast. It surely could not have come from Jesus in its present form.

Some think that instead of a direct conscious reference to Jesus' death we have here only an accidental coincidence with no designed allusion, and that the abuse and murder of the servants refer to the treatment meted out to prophets or to the Baptist. Of course, as in all the parables, its very nature is only supposititious, not factual, and we find little aid from legalistic or archaeological scholarship, or indeed, from the context. On its face it seems minatory to a priesthood which had arrogated divine authority and usurped proprietorship, where it was only vicegerent, and which had crushed by force reformers, those sent of heaven to exact tribute due to the Supreme Ruler whom they should loyally serve. It very likely epitomizes the stories of prophets sent to kings to remind them that the state was still a theocracy and Yahveh their liege lord. It is perhaps spiritual rather than temporal power that would usurp divine right and dominion, and so it illustrates in Semitic wise the same fatal *hubris* or pride that in Hellenic story always brought down Jove's thunderbolts or invoked the avenging fates or furies. This parable is a lighthouse erected where the sirens

of ambition lure to the breakers of pontifical assumption. The heavenly Father whom Jesus revealed, although the God of Love, is also the jealous Deity of the old covenant, exquisitely sensitive to slight and insult, and quite capable of laying aside his clemency and wreaking vengeance. Although afar, he is not oblivious, but will have his due and depose and crush all faithless deputies.

38. A king (Matt. xxii: 1-14; Luke xiv: 15-24) sent a servant to call the bidden guests to come to the wedding of his son, but they refused. Another servant was sent to say that the oxen and fatlings were killed and all things ready; but some of those bidden scornfully went their way to their farms and their merchandise, while others abused, and even slew the messengers. Then the king was wroth, and sent his armies, and destroyed the murderers and burned their city. Servants were sent out again to find more worthy guests, and gathered from the highways the good and the bad. When the king came, he found one with no wedding garment, who was speechless when asked why he came thus. Him the king ordered bound and cast into outer darkness where there was weeping and gnashing of teeth; for many are called but few chosen.

The invitation declined by all on account of other occupations was repeated at the last moment by the embarrassed host; but this second time his messengers were insulted and slain, and he, angered, wreaked vengeance upon the recusants. Then, as the feast was already prepared, all without distinction were invited to fill the table. The refusers have been identified with the hierarchy, the Jewish race, the rich or those reared with Christian opportunities, while those who actually partook represent conversely the non-official Jewry, the gentiles, or those outside the Church respectively. On the first two suppositions the destruction of the temple and the fall of Jerusalem or the dispersion have been thought to be prophesied in the king's act of vengeance. This is, however, both less certain and, if meant, less important, than the fact that Jesus was rejected by the rulers of the synagogue. In view of this he is alternately indignant and pathetic. Disappointment and incomplete foreknowledge seem involved in the very essence of this parable. The invitation of those who came is an afterthought as if they were heaven's second choice. If it worked well, then the course of events was wiser than the king's original purpose. This tone of disappointment, indeed, pervades much of Jesus' career, and there are many expressions of baffling defeat which were genuine and not affected. They seem to make the theological theory that he had a clear,

higher foreknowledge doubtful; or, at least those views of his divinity which interfere with his humanity and render the incarnation incomplete. His primary intention was not to be a saviour of the gentiles; and we here see in the destruction of his rejectors his fury and unassuaged indignation. It was an ominous threat by a man of war and retaliation, not, however, without sufficient cause. He came to his own with a doctrine of life that was the needed food for their very souls, but was summarily rejected. To prepare it had cost him long and hard travail of soul, and he had felt assured it would be welcomed as Gospel indeed; but it was met not only with indifference but with scorn, and so, as if piqued, his gift was offered to and accepted by those in whom he had less interest. This was also a prominent feature in the experience of Confucius, Buddha, and to some extent Mohammed and is of most foreign missionaries to-day. Their disciples were not those they most desired to reach. All great reforms are marked by similar discontinuity. Those who are called are not those who come. New races and classes take up the burden of progress, and the old are ploughed under. This extension of the scope of his principle of new bottles for new wine Jesus does not here appear to see. It is this that makes every great step in advance more or less paroxysmal. A fully developed cult resists transpeciation, and every appeal back to first principles must be to those not preoccupied but open and candid. The highly specialized social soma must die, and new germ plasma must develop new organisms. In choosing as his disciples plain men of the people, and in appealing to the masses, Jesus recognized this law. It is not flattering to those who accepted his call that they seem to be an afterthought. But in this parable it is not they whom he has primarily in mind. He is addressing those in high places in Israel. Thus here, as always, we must remember that each utterance of Jesus is aimed at a specific end, and often he has an individual or a small group only in mind. This method is to be evaluated by its efficacy for the special purpose for which it was used. Thus Socrates felt to the prytany and Luther to the Church of his day.

The treatment of the man without a wedding garment may have been aggravated by the king's indignation against the absentees and suggests that one in the new circle lacked appreciation of the honour he received. The incident is not easy to interpret conformably to Jesus' love of the poor and his lack of respect for forms. Some have thought it showed that he was not himself entirely emancipated from formality. Others have symbolized it as a reproof to those who think faith can suffice without works, or, again, as referring to those who would accept the privileges of religion covertly without being known to others by any outward badge. Ritualists have even seen here commendations of vestments in worship, the importance of which is

measured by the severity of the penalty for not having them on. The more obvious lesson, however, seems to be that piety demands some outward token by which it can be known, some external conformity that distinguishes the guests of heaven from those in the common world. The extreme punishment suggests that the meaning may lie in a still deeper stratum of life, and teaches that piety should always be clad in conduct and cannot be a matter of mere sentiment; that true worship cannot dispense with outward forms; or that religion must transform life. If, however, it is the gentiles that are here invited, the allusion gains a new and interesting pertinence, for their pagan forms of worship would be very likely to offend. On the whole, however, we incline to this latter view that Jesus here reprimands a pagan novice in whom the new faith had not yet found a better expression, but who would adore the true God under the form of worship belonging to Jove, Ishtar, Semiramis, or some other heathen deity. If this is the pith of the parable, the mediaeval Church was lax in conforming to it, and indeed it is doubtful if the Church ever went as far in tolerating the man without the wedding garment as modern religious pedagogy and psychology would warrant.

The unusual diversities both in the settings and the items of the two synoptists have suggested to some that Jesus repeated this parable on different occasions with variations, although there is no reason to think that he did this in any case. More think that it illustrates the freedom of treatment of a single clear parable under the influence of strong allegorizing propensities, and perhaps that Luke's version of it is most elaborate as well as, of course, more Pauline-Calvinistic. A man without a wedding garment some, e. g., Weiss, think a displaced reference to the guests first invited, while others, e. g., Ewald, think it a fragment of a different but lost parable. It shows Jesus' high initial hope for his race undergoing progressive disillusionment.

39. A farmer had a fig-tree (Luke xiii: 6-9) and sought fruit thereon, but found none and told the dresser to cut it down, as this was the third year he had come and found it barren; but the dresser pleaded for one more year in which he would dig about and dung it, and only then, if it was still barren, cut it down. The implication is that this intercession prevailed.

Thus Jesus, the dresser, pruner, gardener, might plead with the Yahveh of the Old Testament prophets of impending judgment to suspend it a little longer. The tree might be old and decayed, yet it might bloom again. It may typify an individual, a family, a Church, a race, or all mankind, for in this little silhouette is the multiplicity of

allusion that characterizes most of the parables that Jesus did not himself explain. Men, like trees, are known by their fruits, which are good works, and in the divine economy if a person or institution is sterile it has no longer any *raison d'être.* But as barren wombs have sometimes been made to bear, and patient mulching may fructify a tree that has for years borne nothing but leaves, so to a religious community that has been unfruitful there may come a good and prolific year again. The barren tree has certainly borne so rich a fruitage of song and homily that the very vocabulary of Christian experience would be impoverished without it. It teaches that the end of life, indeed, the only things that justify its continued existence, are moral deeds and the graces of religious character. God has no other measure or standard of values. The luscious leaves of the fig-tree, the old pulpiteers have told us, are mental culture, accomplishments, knowledge; but all these are not even worthy of mention, and are no justification for prolonging life.

40. Ten virgins (Matt. xxv: 13; Luke xiii: 25-30) awaited summons to a wedding by night. Five forgot to put oil in their lamps. At midnight when the bridegroom was announced and this omission discovered, the wise maidens refused to share their oil lest there be not enough for both, while the foolish maids who had to go back for it found on their return that not only was the door shut, but they were refused admission and were told that they were unknown. They were not prepared for the untimed but impending arrival of the Son of Man, the heavenly Bridegroom, and the exhortation is to watch with all preparations made in advance.

[In its form this is a simple admonition as to schoolgirls to be forehanded and provident on penalty of missing a festivity dear to every maiden heart. But its content and mission are a significant warning to be ready always for death or for the coming of the bridegroom of the Church to his own. The eschatological motive is dominant and loud. Be ever ready, though the hour steal on one unawares like a thief in the night. Had the householder known at what hour the burglar would enter he would not have suffered house-break, and the evil servant finding that his lord's return was delayed would not have beaten his fellow servants and rioted until, at the unannounced return, he was cut asunder, and sent among hypocrites where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. The Lord may come suddenly at cock-crow or later and find us sleeping, as the flood found men eating, drinking, and merrying. The coming of the Kingdom will find two men in a field,

two women at a mill; one will be taken and the other left. We must use every safeguard against surprise. This is a drastic, nerve-tensing, anxious moral. Even the sects that have lived under a sense of the impending end of all things, like a Damocles sword above their heads, have found easement in setting the day, if not the hour, when the crack of doom was to come. To live each day and hour as if it were the last has always been a Christian rule of life. From the Baptist, Jesus had learned the potency of interpreting all in terms of here and now, instead of putting everything important afar in time and space. Thus present realization was one of the secrets of Jesus' power as well as a measure of it, as we elsewhere see. The very essence of greatness is to presentify it, to see everything actualized here and now and in me. This is in a sense the quintessence of religion, and in another way also of psychology.

It is not only hard to enter the Kingdom, but (Luke xiii: 24-30) it may be too late before we know it. When the master has once shut the door the tardy seeker will knock and plead that it may be opened, but the master of the house will say, I know you not. They will urge that they have eaten and drunk in his presence and heard him teach in the street, and again he will say, I know you not. Depart, all ye workers of iniquity. They shall weep and gnash their teeth when they see Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the prophets and people from all the points of the compass, in the Kingdom and they themselves be thrust out. Many that are last shall be first and the first last.

Open as the entrance to the Kingdom now is, there will come a time when it will be forever too late to gain entrance. Those who knock after this hour has once struck will be ignored, condemned, and sent away. They shall see the great men of old and many strangers from afar that seem to them interlopers, with the Great Companion whom they knew in daily intercourse, but he will no longer have compassion or hear their cry, and they will be eternally banished from his presence to woe. Though they thought themselves the elect, they shall find that they are castaways.

This hallowed fable Jesus devised, like others of his pedagogic masterpieces, to warn against procrastination. Again we hear the tocsin, *now*—and he paints in a few strong strokes the consequences of delay. It is hard to believe that so sympathetic, indulgent, and inviting a friend, who begged and pleaded with and would accept all, will soon turn to heartless adamant against the entreaties of old associates; but they are forewarned and so will have no excuse and must not be astonished. This hardly seems to comport with post-mortem probation, and it must be a rather exiguous exegesis that finds it here. Moral reforms seem to all easy, at least for a time; but habits grow entrenched and freedom fades from reality to an illusion till, at some

awful but unknown moment, as we proceed along the way of life on which no return is possible, we pass the last fork of the road all unwittingly. Every one has his own moral dead-line, one perhaps for each besetting sin, after passing which there are only might-have-beens, regrets, and vengeance. This ethicodynamic principle, drawn here as Jesus loved to do in eschatological colours, is as true as the psychophysic law, though not yet expressed in terms of calculus. The law of progressive habituation, already among the most interesting and practical of the chapters in modern psychology, is outlined negatively and given a moral point of ultimate reprobation. This, too, is one of the supports of the familiar doctrine of grieving the Spirit till it takes its final departure. To be almost persuaded; to be chronically on the brink of the great choice but never taking the decisive step, slowly creates hovering indecision as a habitus, well personified by Bunyan in Mr. Facing-Both-Ways. The process goes on without knowledge or realization, and there slowly supervenes the gradual abatement of even desire for good, so that Jesus here, with true artistic instinct, represents the seekers as realizing their position just at the critical moment *after* it is too late, so as to heighten the pathos of it all. He chooses the psychological moment of inception into the hopeless state when hope and desire have not yet faded.

41. A parable of the Kingdom (Matt. xx: 1-16) is that of the employer of labour who engaged men at six in the morning for a twelve-hour day, at the stipulated price of a penny. At nine, twelve, three, and five o'clock he engaged others. Those employed at the eleventh hour, who had wrought but one hour, were both paid first and given the wage of an entire day. When, last of all, those who began earliest and had borne the labour and heat of the day received only what was promised, they murmured, not that those who had worked less time were overpaid but that they had themselves received no more compensation than the contract price. The employer answered that he had kept his word; they must be satisfied; he had a right to do what he would with his own. "The last shall be first and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen."

The moral here has some connection with that of the prodigal, the lost sheep, and the penny. Those who enter the Kingdom late have the same usufruct of it and are even preferred, at least in the order of payment, over those who began early in the morning. The interpretation is often made that a death-bed repentance is as profitable as a life of service. Salvation is all God's gift that he may bestow

according to his sovereign pleasure, and frail man must not cavil or repine.

To modern sensibilities this lacks something of sweet reasonableness, but so do many of the hardships that seem bound up with man's relation to the laws of nature. As a matter of policy such practice would soon bring confusion into any modern industrial group. The warmer welcome for the tardy penitent than for one who has never fallen is a hard doctrine. This Galilean fisher of men was perhaps baiting his hook well to cast it far over toward Satan's dominions, exulting especially over every catch drawn out of the slowly closing net of the great enemy over whom these were trophies of victory. A premium upon eleven hours of sloth would soon reduce the length of the working-day to one hour: but perhaps this is further than the scope of the parable goes, for the day here represents the entire life of man.

42. A man (Matt. xxv: 14-30; Luke xix: 11-27) on travel bent gave five, two, and one talents to his servants according to their ability. Those who had five and two respectively doubled their capital, but he who had but one hid it in the earth. The master on returning listens to each and rewards the first two alike. They have proven faithful in a few, and so are made rulers over many things and introduced to the Lord's joy. The man with one talent pleads in his excuse that he was afraid of the master, as he was a hard man. He is told that if the master is exacting, all the more should he at least have put out the money to interest. As a punishment his talent is taken away and given to the man who has ten; for to those who have shall be given, and from those with little even that shall be taken. The profitless servant is then cast into darkness and torment.

Talents are the power of doing good that increase by use, and it is implied here that as the man of two was rewarded in the same way as was he of five talents, so the man of one, had he doubled his gift, would also have had the same reward, proportionately, as the others would have had the same penalty had they followed his course. Throughout Christian history perhaps the most pervasive lesson of this parable is that there are differences of ability among men—that they are not equal. Second to this, although probably the chief meaning Jesus intended it to convey, was that he of one gift should strive as hard, and by so doing have equal merit, as he of five. According to the purport of other parables, perhaps he would meet even greater reward than the others, like the eleventh-hour labourer. Certainly the temptation to inactivity is greater for him. He is, to be sure, poor in spirit, and

comes under a special beatitude which he has not realized, but it is censorious apathy like his from which social discontent and even anarchy sometimes spring. Common average ability, and even subnormality, thus carry no exemption from common duty.

In this, as in the other mundane parables of Jesus, there is no mystery, and we feel in the study of them no sense of superhuman wisdom. All is simple, human, homely, clear, central; and nothing in the whole sphere of morals is easier to comprehend or, we might add, harder to fashion daily life and thought upon. In our age of the lust for power, which Nietzsche thinks man's supreme passion, to feel weak is supreme misery and brings peculiar temptation to balk. It has never been so discouraging to be small or average, to renounce all distinction and public applause, to live obscurely with content and fidelity, as in our democratic days, when all seems open to all who can attain. Jesus was no equalist, but he lashes the recusant and recreant who will do nothing because they cannot do much. Those of this type who are faithful indeed deserve special praise; for even if they have not overcome special temptations it is hard to rise to their full opportunity to live, which really is found in the possibility of living more unselfishly, tranquilly, and with purer motives than others. We wish Jesus had given us also a parable rewarding a man of one talent who had used it to the uttermost, for his reward would doubtless have been greater than that of all the others.

43. In the parable of the unjust steward (Luke only, xvi: 1-13) a rich man's agent is charged with wastefulness and summoned to account. Fearful of losing his position, and being unable to dig and unwilling to beg, he makes friends of his master's creditors by summoning each and accepting from one his note for half and from another for four-fifths of his indebtedness. This he does so that, if he is deposed, he may find favour with those whose debt he has dishonestly reduced and who are thus made parties to his crime, and will also be bound to him by ties of gratitude. This deed, which modern law has punished as fraud for centuries, the master, who is also a loser, commends, ignoring its injustice to him, because it illustrates sagacity and fidelity to unrighteous Mammon in details which would be commendable if the cause were great and just. A steward thus circumstanced must choose between faithfulness to the master or to his debtors, for he cannot serve both.

This has never been a favourite parable for the pulpit, and often seems the despair of exegetes and ethical apologists. Some have even thought it misunderstood or misreported. The latter part of the

narrative appears either to have covert connotation or to reflect a confused state of mind on Luke's part. A few negative critics have not only challenged Jesus' soundness here, but have charged him with commending flagrant and palpable chicanery, and have hinted that in his Oriental environment Jesus' conceptions of equity and business integrity had remained undeveloped. Others more favourably disposed interpret the owner as God and the steward as Jesus, the great remitter of man's debts of sin; but this has difficulties, for Jesus' stewardship is not imperilled nor is he obliged to choose between fidelity to sinful man and to his Lord. Neither is there any reason to think that he would commend such methods of equalizing wealth. Instead of collecting debts that creditors acknowledge to be just, the steward conspires with them to defraud, thus corrupting them, and while he himself does not directly share the spoils of the rebates, he expects to receive the full value in good will and favours, should he need them. If we assume the rich lord to be Satan himself as the prince of this world, and the creditors those sold under sin whose obligations to him Jesus reduces, then we have a meaning which comports well with the mediaeval conception, which long abounded in many a monkish tale of duping and outwitting the devil. But on such a view we cannot explain the lord's commendation of the act. The moral context welters with confusion. Again, Jesus, it has been said, was an unpractical idealist who felt strongly the need of more of the same worldly sagacity in the administration of the affairs of the Kingdom that controls mundane affairs, and if this be so the parable is a crude expression crudely reported of this conviction. Still others have thought that Jesus here and elsewhere implies that property is robbery, and so pitied poor creditors that he commends even questionable means toward the more equitable distribution of wealth. Wendt[1] says this prudent agent is commended for providing by present needs for his future welfare. We must so use the goods God entrusts to us to secure heavenly reward. The Lord owns all; we are only his trustees, and instead of wasting the fiduciary resources in our hands we should use them in conciliating the claims of those who owe us. By these means if we are reduced to beggary we shall have deposits in the bank of their gratitude. Thus we have here counsel to spendthrifts foreseeing utter bankruptcy and providing for it by liberality to their friends while they yet have the means. But at best the parable is tortuous and confused, inconsistent with the teaching of the other parables of husbandmen and their agents, and either belonging to the decadent stage of Jesus' parable method of teaching or, probably, an imperfect record not understood by Luke; and, at any rate, as it now stands, of but the slightest significance to us.

[1] "The Teaching of Jesus." I, p. 235, II, p. 377.

44. Of all the parables, the number of which is estimated according to different criteria all the way from thirty-two by Briggs to fifty-three by Jülicher, the one most classic in form, clearest in meaning, possibly the first, and at any rate the one which Jesus himself explained most fully, is that of the sower (Matt. xiii: 3-32; Luke viii: 5-15). As he sowed, some seed fell by the roadside and was trodden down or devoured by fowls. The word is heard, but Satan snatches it away lest it be understood and believed unto salvation.

The beaten path is the heart waxed gross, the eye that sees not, and the ear that hears not. Spiritual dullards are utterly unimpressionable and hopeless, and perhaps this refers to the scribes and Pharisees, whose souls the devil had seared. Wasted and unappreciated truths are like pearls before swine, and great teachers like Plato have shrunk from proclaiming their best truths to those utterly unfit to receive them. Souls smitten with the mildew of *nil admirari* and indifference, who abhor all that is new, have always been the terror of great teachers and reformers. Dread of them has caused all the differentiations that have been made between exoteric and esoteric teachings, and had something to do in leading Jesus to devise his own invention of a new type of parable which, like a cathedral window, looks dull and dingy to those without, but to those within is beautiful with light. Of all the conservatives, reactionaries, and obscurantists, moral and religious cynics are the worst; and who that is smitten with the love of the ideal does not shrink from their presence as from profanation? They chill, blight, disenchant, are precipitate to criticise before they understand. The preachers of the simple life in "Vanity Fair"; of exiguous honesty to the promoters of frenzied finance; of exquisite chastity, even in thought, in the gilded halls of licensed prostitution; of philosophic temperance in a saloon; of the conclusions of science concerning the ultimate constitution of the universe to the superstitious and ignorant, are sowing by the wayside and wasting both effort and seed, for those whom they address are, at the best, hearers only and not doers. Perhaps Plato might have given them some credit because he held that theory goes part way toward practice; but for Jesus even a little knowing without doing only adds condemnation. The seed does not even sprout, but feeds the enemies of the crops.

Second, there are stony places with poor and shallow soil where the word is heard and received with joy; but when the sun of tribulation, persecution, or temptation is hot, the tender shoot withers to the root. The impregnation of souls thus symbolized is followed by early miscarriage. Offence and abortion are easy. The superficial who pave hell with good intentions; the neologists, or culturists ever seeking

some new thing; people with quick perceptions, easy apprehension, ready expression, with a veritable lust for the easy first stages of knowledge and with as veritable an aversion for thoroughness; those with only the dry light of intelligence, in whose souls there is no irrigation or even seepage from deep perdurable enthusiasm which is the water of life; the neuroticism that always loves to begin and never can finish—these constitute a true psychic type which is alternately the hope and exasperation of the true teacher. The religious smatterers and backsliders who put their hands to the plow and turn back; who begin to build without counting the cost; who take lamps with no oil in them; who say "I go," but go not; who are almost but not quite persuaded; who in youth give precocious promise which is never fulfilled—these, no doubt, were often the despair of Jesus, and it was such followers who discouraged Buddha and angered Mohammed. This class illustrates dementia præcox in religion. Their piety is a kind of air-plant, perhaps an annual rather than a perennial growth. It was those of this diathesis who balked at martyrdom in the early Church, and have made up the great body of recanters. Here the mediaeval dogmatists found the true sin against the Holy Ghost.[1] This is often, too, the tragedy of great truth for little minds, of all-sided culture for cheap souls or those with a single facet. The Gospel seed can never ripen on thin soil which cannot improve itself. Thus, back of this parable there perhaps lurks a fatalism that makes the redemption of such acreage impossible. To raise such a question, however, is to press the parable beyond its legitimate scope.

The third class of hearers is parabled as thorny ground where weeds and tares representing the care, riches, and lust of worldly things spring up and choke the wheat. These, another parable teaches, cannot be removed without uprooting the crop. Here the soil is rich and deep, but rank with other growths sown perhaps at night by the devil, the god of weeds. The guilt of this class is clearer, for not talent but will is lacking. In place of the *summum bonum* they have chosen *secunda bona* or at best moral *allotria*. There is no conscious *noluntas* for good, but only *voluntas* for other things—perhaps the will to power, fame, wealth. Their high idealism has faded into the light of common day, and in its place have come sordid greed, tuft-hunting and pelf-hunting. They have apostatized to other gods, or their piety is smothered in some isolated compartment of the soul where it is dormant save on Sundays or in stereotyped ways. Business has supplanted Bethel. Religion, which should be supreme, is subordinate. They have declined the Bridegroom's invitation with many an excuse, and have become servitors of practical utilities, worshippers of Mammon, and so the way to heaven has narrowed down for them to the dimensions of a

[1] See one of the most desperate and pathetic illustrations in the account of Francesca Spiera by Philip Schaff, "Die Sünde wieder den Heiligen Geist." Halle, 1841, p. 173-210

needle's eye. One world at a time, and now this, is perhaps their maxim. To-day in academic life it is this class who ask the money value of studies and courses, and disregard culture values. A life of high living and plain thinking has no charm for such. They build barns, lay up store of goods, eat and drink, and forget that their souls may at any moment be required of them.

Lastly, fertile soil stands for those who hear, understand, and do; those who have waited, longed, and are ripe and ready for the word; the wise to whom a hint is sufficient, for whom even parables are hardly needed, and who intuit at once their meaning and are fittest for esoteric impartations by the rich and condensed language of hints and chapter heads. Tribulation only increases their faith, and conviction is prompt, complete, and lasting. All that sprouts comes to full fruitage. The law was originally written on their hearts, and needs only a touch to bring it out in consciousness.[1]

This brilliant parable is the key to several others, and supplements much other teaching. There is nothing enigmatical about it, and perhaps it least needed Jesus' exposition. Dull indeed must have been the disciples who required this detailed explanation of it. These four kinds of ground stand for four pedagogic temperaments as characteristic and distinct as any of the types of modern genetic psychology or ethology. Every teacher of new and higher truths could supply a generous anthology of illustrations of each one of the four from his own experience. Indeed, these supplement our present knowledge of the psychology of the learning process somewhat as Plato's myths do his philosophy. These are ways in which education does or fails to do its proper work of supplementing heredity. These are the four great reactions of the soul to truth. Here all the Herbartian interests may be subsumed. Pedagometric scales might best be established along these lines. This is Jesus' confession of his educational policy, and it probably gives us a key to the principles on which he chose his disciples and the Seventy, focussing his best endeavours on the inner group of the fourth class, for the mostly lost and unrecorded instruction of whom the world must forever mourn. Had this been accessible, how different the conceptions of Christendom concerning his life and work might have been, and what labour of painfully reconstructing from popular utterances his inmost creed might have been saved!

The wealth of pedagogic experience and insight in these few apothegmatic phrases is nothing less than amazing. In this confessional revelation we get nearest to the heart of the Great Teacher and can realize how deeply he must have pondered the ways and means of impressing his doctrine, as he had to do, without the aid of writing,

[1] Tradition would have us infer that Jesus' teaching is illustrated by the definition of a college as Mark Hopkins on one end of a log teaching Garfield on the other.

tests, or organizing a mere school in the classic sense. How apt for his and for all subsequent time was his choice of the agricultural simile of grain-growing! One wonders whether Jesus felt that all these types were illustrated among his own disciples. In this parable no censure of any of these four classes is implied for it is all a question of native quality, of unfertilized soil. The seed always and everywhere grows as best it can, and it is only inherited ability typified by the soil that differs. Elsewhere, but not here, are manuring, digging about the roots, and pulling up tares considered. Here Jesus seems almost fatalistically resigned as to the nature of the soil, and this was doubtless his attitude as to the very diverse endowments of his immediate followers. From the nature of the records of his life, and from his frequent rebukes of dullness of apprehension on the part of his followers, must we not infer that he had most of all at heart yet another or fifth kind of companions who could not be classified by a figure of speech drawn from the domain of vegetable life, viz., those who dimly felt the power of the truth he taught and strove to their uttermost to comprehend but constantly fell short, and, owing to their inherent limitations, incessantly misconceived him? With Boswellian devotion, but with a pragmatic shortage of understanding sometimes suggesting even the typical pedant of Faust, these biographers could be only fags of the Holy Ghost while striving to their uttermost to be its oracles, understanding even the parables only when an explanation was vouchsafed them. Would that Jesus had left us his own luminous explanation of other of his parables instead of trusting them or us to supply it! Indeed, it seems strange, incompetent as their comments upon his teachings often show them to be to give such interpretation, that if he had any forefeeling that his inculcations were to be transmitted to future generations, he did not more often explain himself.

45. The Kingdom (Mark iv: 26-9) is as when a man casts seed into the ground, goes to sleep, and rises day after day, while the seed springs up and grows, he knows not how, whether he wakes or sleeps. The earth bringeth forth fruit of itself, the blade, the ear, and the full corn; but when the fruit is ripe, man puts in his sickle to the harvest.

The growth impulse of nature supplements the work of man. The seed seems buried in the dark, cold earth till the springtide when nature rises again, and it sprouts and grows all summer. Man sleeps, but nature does not. We know not how the great spirit of life works. It is thus, however, that the Kingdom grows by the profound laws of evolution far below consciousness, if we only plant good seed betimes.

The Kingdom, then, here is like a crop. Nothing is said of the nature of the soil, of fertilizing, watering, or weeding; but the stress is on the growth impulse of which man avails himself, and this growth is here and not hereafter. The Kingdom will grow and ripen inevitably without attention on man's part, as if it were in the inmost nature of things to do so. Man must do his part, and God and nature will do the rest. Man does not even need to watch. Growth proceeds very slowly and surely, stage by stage. Such has been the law ever since cibiculture and the domestication of plants began.

This parable is often thought to symbolize the part that good impressions play if made upon the soul very early in life—which, even though they seem to be lost, are really germinant. Although those in whose hearts they are growing know it not, they will bring harvest of good deeds in time. From this point of view we are dealing with the under or unconscious soul in man, which once fructified does the rest of itself. This parable, therefore, seems to be strongly anti-Pauline, for it means that the inborn nature of man is pure and good in itself, and not depraved or corrupt. Thus, not only our vegetative and autonomous but also our instinctive and intuitive nature, receives seed like good ground, and stimulates it to grow and ripen. This is quite in accord with the later psychogenetic and psychoanalytic view of the prepotency of infantile impressions; for the unconscious in us is the childlike, and the childlike is the unconscious. No good in this plastic age is lost.

46. Another parable which Jesus himself explained is that of the tares (Matt. xiii: 24-30 and 36-43). The Kingdom is like a man who sowed good grain, but while his workmen slept an enemy sowed tares, so that both sprang up together. The servants came to the owner and asked, Did you not sow good seeds; whence, then, these tares? He replied that an enemy had done it. When asked whether they should pluck up the tares he said, No, lest the wheat also be uprooted. Both must grow until the harvest, and then the reapers will be ordered first to gather the tares, bundle, and burn them, and then bring the wheat to the barn.

When he had sent the multitude away and the disciples were alone, they asked him to explain, which he did by saying that the sower is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seeds are the children of the Kingdom; the tares, of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them, the devil; the harvest, the end of the world; the reapers, the angels, sent

forth to gather sinners, who would be cast into a furnace with wailing and gnashing of teeth, while the righteous should shine as the sun in the Kingdom.

Here again Jesus is the sower, and the seed is growing according to its soil; but by a scurvy trick the god of weeds steals in by night and inseminates the ground with his undomesticated, outlawed crop; and, contrary to the mediaeval legends, wherein he is always worsted, he here outwits the Lord, so much so that before the latter knows it, the weeds have taken such root that to pull them will uproot the crop, the more as the more abundant and rank are the weeds. Thus, as the mischief is done, nothing remains but to await and harvest what of the crop is unchoked, and burn the *Unkraut*, as in John's preaching the winnowed out chaff is burned; or, as elsewhere from a full net the good fish are saved and the bad thrown away. Here forbearance and the awful fate of the wicked are set forth. It is not here taught that good needs evil to bring it to full maturity, but God's tolerance of sin is ascribed to his tenderness for the good. Against the faith of ancient Israel it is here frankly assumed that sin is not punished in the present life; though here the parable, if taken too literally, halts a little, for many weeds may be uprooted to the advantage of many a crop without serious jeopardy, as society often promptly punishes evil, not only without injury to the good but to its great advantage. If the tares and weeds are not persons, as we are told they are, but qualities in each individual, the meaning becomes in some sense clearer. It is vain, however, to speculate what would happen if all the human tares were weeded out by Divine Providence. A fatalism, too, is implied, because the tares cannot be transmuted into grain, but from each seed only its like can grow. Hence, the implication would make Jesus' mission to save the lost nugatory. The purport, however, is consoling because of the certainty of the future penalty of the wicked after their lush and unpunished life here. Even where sin abounds we must not doubt the ultimate justice or doom of evil. This is another form of the draft Jesus so often loved to draw on the great bank of the future, failure of which would have left him and his cause bankrupt indeed. Its credit is called faith, and his system of doing business with it is what we call eschatology. The key-word of this parable is, *Wait*; possess your souls in patience. The evil are but laying up wrath, and the longer the delay the more terrible it will be when it comes. Heavenly laws work slowly but surely. Sin will end, not by the gradual selective process of elimination of the unfit, and the natural survival of the fittest; but at a certain point there will be a supernal intervention of divine agents with fearful and swift execution of judgment. Here again, despite the injunction to patience,

we see Jesus' convulsive or catastrophic diathesis. At a certain point the powers of righteousness will break loose and sweep away all that offend, with the besom of destruction. Over and over again he tells of weeping, wailing, gnashing of teeth, fire, sword, thunder, lightning, earthquake; so that nothing in all earth's sad litany of woes and horrors is in his view too terrible for the foes of the Kingdom, and the world lives in the aura of a great convulsion from which a new earth is to emerge like a butterfly from the ugly chrysalis. The great metamorphosis doubtless seemed to him now near, now farther away, but rarely beyond the life of some then living, and he eagerly scanned earth, heaven, and the souls of men for signs and foregleams of its coming. Despite its terrors it was a consummation to be devoutly wished and prayed for. This tension between the real world and that of his ideals grew painful at times. Such polar opposition would at some point become insupportable; and then, when the crisis came, all who offended would be destroyed in dreadful but rapid stages and the chosen would shine forth, for the glorified world could produce no tares or weeds.

So far this article in the program of Jesus is unfulfilled, and many a crop of tares and wheat in varying proportions has grown together for two millennia. The Christian world has everywhere practically ceased to expect a harvest of fire. The conception of it has become impotent, and if it is anywhere held to it is relegated to the post-mortem world. The method of evolution has discredited that of revolution, although if the best only survive, the result is even more certain though longer deferred. The essentials of Jesus' faith are confirmed, and the minor matters of means and method changed. Impetuous souls like his, with perfervid ethical passion, still occasionally lose their temporal perspective and see all that they hope and strive for near at hand. But the more we study this psychosis, the more clearly we see that Jesus' belief was no distemper, but only a conscience inflamed with true zeal, putting our own faith in the form which perhaps at his age was both most artistic and morally effective. Thus optimists have still but to follow the council of this parable, wait without doubting, and never cease to sow good seed for fear of the weeds of diabolus.

47. The Kingdom (Matt. xiii: 47-50) is like a net cast into the sea, gathering all; and when it was full they drew it ashore, and sat down and gathered the good into vessels and threw the bad away. So, at the end of the world, the angels shall sever the wicked from the just, and cast them into a furnace where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Selection is the theme here. Sorting weeds from grain, chaff from wheat, leaves from fruit, symbolizes what might as well be illustrated by parting small, rotten, pest-injured specimens of any kind of crop, wild or cultivated, from those that are perfect, or dross from good metal, or inferior or diseased animals of every kind from those best fitted to survive; and the same principle of sortage might be applied to human families and races. Evolution is always doing this. We might now interpret the Church as the net gathering fish from the world, and some have suggested a proportion between the relatively few fish caught in a net compared to the vast numbers in the sea, and those really Christian compared to the population of the world. Some think the Church the vessel in which the good are put. So, too, opinions differ as to what the catch itself is. It may be death, and the sorting may be the judgment. At any rate, it is now too late to convert bad works into good; for the fish are already dead, and have only to be separated. Perhaps there are as many standards of selection as there are species of fish. Bad fish are very bad and very dangerous, and this fact may have been an unconscious determinant and contributed its quota of reinforcement.

48. The Kingdom of heaven (Matt. xiii: 31-32; Luke xiii: 18-19) is like a grain of mustard seed, the least of all seeds, sown in the earth. But when it is grown up it is the greatest of all herbs, and the fowls of the air can lodge in its branches. Again, it is like leaven (Matt. xiii: 33; Luke xiii: 20-21) which a woman hid in three measures of meal till all was leavened.

This optimism takes no heed of any adverse influences. The tiny seed becomes a very great tree, and the leaven pervades the whole mass. Scholars have found out that in Palestine mustard never grows more than twelve feet high and that birds never nest in it, and so other authorities have believed that another larger tree-like plant (*Salvadora persica*) was here suggested, which has some similar qualities, and which often grows twenty-five feet high, bearing berries which birds love. If the tree is the Church this is somewhat more fit, but hyperbole is still involved. A mustard seed was in current Hebrew proverbs a symbol of smallness; yet many think Jesus' botanical knowledge was here at fault. Other exegetes have dwelt on the taste, colour, form, medical effects, of mustard seed in a very irrelevant if ingenious way, but the meaning that from small beginnings great things arise is the central thought. Some say the tree is the Messiah, others that it is the very few true believers; the ground is the earth or its people; the birds of the air are the population of all climes that

enter the Kingdom, etc. Some think that the tree is Paul, and others, the Gospel. The leaven is a more culinary parable, the ephah being the largest of the then-current standards of measurement. It suggests a departure from the unleavened bread sacred to the Hebrews. Heathenism, too, is about to be leavened. It signifies fermentation. Both of these parables mean only that Jesus' ideal will be completely accomplished, and we are here simply given a convenient and portative expression for the current growth and universal prevalence of the new dispensation, so humble in its beginnings. Its development is to be quiet, without convulsion and unobserved. It should be remembered that Jesus here is not philosophical but prophetic.

49. The Kingdom of heaven (Matt. xiii: 44-47) is like a treasure hid in a field, having found which, a man keeps secret but sells all he has and buys the field. Or again, it is like a man seeking precious pearls, who having found one of the greatest value sells all he has to buy it.

As one sacrifices all minor treasures for one very great one, so all else should be gladly given up for the Kingdom. For its sake everything ought to be renounced. Such a procedure is only business shrewdness. Perhaps the secrecy concerning the field containing the treasure is aimed at the exclusiveness of the Jews, while some think that this refers to the inwardness of the higher life. Both find the prize and set its true high worth upon it. There is here no tedious seeking, but having found, there is the greatest effort to possess the prize. Discipleship costs much. Here, too, salvation is bought by those who attain it, and is not a gift. Catholic theologians find here a similitude of the monkish life with its three vows of renunciation, viz., property, family, and will. Everything should be offered up gladly for the Kingdom. It is spoken of as if it were a possible private possession, and so perhaps it means the Kingdom within rather than that without. Something priceless becomes my very own property. I am not a collector, but am impelled to own one only thing of transcendent worth.

H. Unser,[1] describing the parable of the pearl, tells us that in the liturgy of the early Church Christ was made the "pearl born of Maria." The ancient folk-soul conceived the pearl as born of lightning striking the sea, and it was thus always conceived in a mussel shell. It is thus a precious stone made out of flesh, and was thought to symbolize God born of the body of his mother and not, like others, a product of carnal intercourse. As the bivalve opens to let in the "moon dew,"

[1] "Vorträge und Aufsetze." 1907, p. 219 f.

as other folklore has it, the pearl is born, and the lightning only loosens it from its attachment to the shell when it is ripe. This is a widespread Syrian myth, going back to the time of Jesus. Thus, too, Aphrodite was born with the sea for her father, and rose to the surface in a shell, as she is so often represented in art. She was known as goddess both of the sea and of pearls. The pearl was Aphrodite's *Doppelgänger*, and there are many symbolic relations that have evolved and that Unser traces to sea-foam and amber. This conception of Christ was motivated by anti-Docetism. This putative origin of the pearl made it a symbol of the annunciation and the virgin birth of Jesus. So, too, the spark of the Holy Ghost in the pure water of baptism generated the new man in Christ.

C. ILLUSTRATIVE NARRATIVES

50. A lawyer (Luke x: 25-37) asked, tempting Jesus, what he should do to inherit life eternal, to which Jesus replied by the counter-question as to how he read the law. He replied that he found in it the behest to love the Lord with all the heart, strength, mind, and to love thy neighbour as thyself. To which Jesus retorted, Do this and thou shalt live. But, inquired the lawyer, who is my neighbour? To this Jesus replied by a parable. A man going from Jerusalem to Jericho fell among thieves, who stripped and wounded him, and left him half dead. Soon a priest chanced to come by and, when he saw, passed by on the other side. A Levite did the same. Then came a Samaritan who, when he saw him, had compassion, bound his wounds, poured oil and wine in them, set him on his beast, brought him to an inn, cared for him overnight, and on leaving in the morning gave the host two pennies to care for him, promising to pay when he came again whatever more was spent. Which of these, asked Jesus, was the true neighbour? The lawyer answered, He who showed mercy. Then, said Jesus, Go thou and do likewise.

This illustrative narrative ends without telling us whether the victim of the assault recovered, or whether the Samaritan performed his pledge to return and pay, but the point is made. Love God and thy neighbour, and thou hast life eternal. To this Jewish theologian "neighbour" is made a distinguished title, and the Samaritan, though a heretic and half heathen, is commended, with implied disparagement of the priest and the Levite. If it were, as some think, a true incident, who would or could have told it? Surely not the half-dead victim. Neighbours thus extend beyond racial or creedal circles. Although, as

Jülicher thinks, Luke's setting was wrong, the meaning is clear. The self-sacrificing expression of love has in the sight of God and man supreme value, transcending all claims of birth and office. Pity more deserves salvation than all the merits of high officials who are selfish. Money, time, and effort were lavished upon the stranger by the alien. Harms finds in this parable only common kindness and no specifically Christian meaning, while others say Christ is himself the Samaritan, the victim is man as the assaults of sin have left him, and the kindness extended to him symbolizes salvation. Some make Paul the Samaritan, others think it chiefly a satire directed against the Jewish hierarchy. Few parables have been so completely incorporated into the Christian consciousness, or are more beloved. It exemplifies one of the best traits of human nature, viz., the sympathy with suffering that makes the whole world kin, or the "feeling of kind" that motivates human solidarity, or the fraternity of truly gregarious man. It is the instinct that has built hospitals, established free clinics, out-patient wards, nursing agencies of all kinds, the Red Cross work, relief for victims of plague, famine, floods, fires, and earthquakes, and as I write, aid for the suffering Belgians. The very name "Good Samaritan" has not only redeemed this discredited race, but connotes all shades and varieties of acts of kindness to the unfortunate. Theologians and poets tell us that this was the very motive that drew Jesus from heaven to earth. All in need are neighbours, and should be cared for as we would wish to be cared for in their place. Make such service a part of self-love as against the vicious precept and practice of ruthless self-maximization. It means mutuality and social service, so that the roots of this apologue go deep down into the animal world, as many records, all the way from Espinas to Sutherland, have shown. Even to keep those socially unfit alive helps to bring out the highest qualities of human nature, and without dependents and defectives normal man would have been far lower down than he is in the scale of altruism.

51. Apropos of those who boasted that they were righteous and despised others, Jesus tells (Luke xviii: 9-14) the apologue of two men who went to pray in the temple. The Pharisee stood and thanked God that he was not like other men, extortionate, unjust, adulterous, or even as this publican. He fasted twice a week and gave tithes of all he possessed. But the publican stood afar and would not even lift his eyes to heaven, but smote his breast and cried, "God, be merciful to me, a sinner." He and not the Pharisee went home justified, for whoso exalteth himself shall be brought low and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

By confession of sin, and not vaunting our self-righteousness, should we approach God. The prayer state of mind is not that of self-laudation, but a cry of mercy from moral humility, and not with pride. This state is the beginning of holiness, as the Socratic conviction of ignorance is of wisdom. In both cases discontent with self augurs growth, as complacency does arrest. A conviction of sin and demerit is one of the striking traits of Christianity, and exists in no such degree in any other religion. Few things Jesus said probably so shocked the complacency of his Jewish contemporaries as that these hated agents of a rapacious and extortionate conqueror, of whose depravity the Jews had the liveliest sense, should by the mere inarticulate expression of his unworthiness be justified of God before the representatives of their own orthodoxy. The publican's prayer meant self-abandonment to divine mercy, and just this extremity makes the Christian God's opportunity. No such self-abasement is involved in any phrase of the model prayer of our Lord. But in the self-conviction of our own righteousness the psychology of conversion has already seen the crucial moment when the soul becomes filled and suffused with a righteousness not its own. The old consciousness is sloughed off, and a new and better one emerges from within. Our dead self is a stepping-stone to our higher life. Indeed, self-consciousness itself is at bottom a witness to and a measure of the degree of man's departure from the true norm of his nature. This acknowledgment of aberrancy and aberration is the culmination. The fruit of the tree of knowledge reveals good and evil, and the only function of true wisdom is to bring sin to light, shed it, and leave us better. There is no true knowledge that is ethically indifferent. This is the psychic quarry where Paul wrought best and deepest, and few of Jesus' precepts suggest so much beyond and above the range of our present knowledge of the soul. If in some respects we seem abreast of Jesus in our insights, here in the psychology of sin we have a vast deal yet to learn, and the best of us can only dimly feel that in this direction Jesus far transcends our ken.

52. A man (Luke xii:13-21) asked Jesus to tell his brother to divide his inheritance with him, but Jesus refused, saying, Who made me a judge and divider for you? Beware of covetousness, for a man's life does not consist in an abundance of the things he hath. A rich man's ground yielded bountifully and he thought, What shall I do to provide room to store my harvests? I will tear down my barns and build greater, and when these are full I will say to my soul, Soul, you have much goods laid up for many years. Eat, drink and be merry. But God said to him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee,

and then whose shall these goods be? Such a man lays up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.

The fate of the foolish rich is here set forth. His folly consists in planning selfish enjoyment when death is unwittingly at hand. In his castle-building revery he forgets the need of God's constant grace. In planning to secure and enlarge his possessions for his personal enjoyment he forgets the Lord of life and death. This warning against greed is not specifically Christian. This large owner had no thought of others, for he was a hard-hearted egoist and thought not of laying up treasure in heaven. The gem of this otherwise aesthetically homely parable is the soliloquy. In fact there is nothing to indicate that rich men just planning to secure their future enjoyment are prone to die; and yet retiring from active affairs to a life of idle self-indulgence is always hygienically a very critical step. To say, "I will henceforth impupate myself and live for personal pleasure," is moral death. Perhaps all who do this deliberately ought, in the interests of the general social well-being, to die at that point, for mere luxury makes men parasites. A sybarite is a drone in the social hive, and in the social economic order is ripe for death. Such a resolution is unintentional suicide. Otherwise God might have demanded not his soul but his property that night. In the sense of this parable all who hoard for selfish enjoyment are fools compassing their own destruction, for true life is love and service to others.

53. There was a rich man, Dives (Luke xvi:19-31), clothed in purple and fine linen and faring sumptuously, and there was a beggar, Lazarus, full of sores, which a dog licked as he lay at the gate, desiring only the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table. Both died, and the plutocrat in hell saw Lazarus in heaven, cried for mercy, and implored Father Abraham for a drop of water on his finger-tip to cool his parched tongue, for he was tormented in the flames. But the patriarch replied, You had in your life good things and Lazarus evil, and now a great gulf which no man can cross is fixed between us. Then, at least, said Dives, Send some one to warn my five brethren lest they come to this place of torment. No, replied Abraham. They have Moses and the prophets and should hear them. But, said Dives, If one goes to them from the dead they will surely repent. Not so, said Abraham. If they hear not Moses and the prophets they would not be persuaded by one from the dead.

The awful imagery of this parable is branded on the very soul of Christendom. This world will be turned topsyturvy in the next, its pleasure will become agony, and its glory shame. The lowest shall be supremely exalted, and the last become first. Rewards of this earth bring penalty in the next, and the very lowest is there supreme. All is fatally fixed beyond all hope of further change. There is no intimation that Dives had any guilt save that of being rich, or that Lazarus had any merit save poverty, unless Dives ought to have known and relieved the suffering of Lazarus; but the next world is represented as simply one of complemental reversal. Wealth here is repaid with hell there, and pauperism with heaven. There is not the slightest mitigation, and all probation has passed. Literature abounds in descriptions of an *au rebours* world where plebeians become princes, kitchen drudges have all the wealth of fairyland, diamonds are stones and stones diamonds. But these are usually thought mere dreams or fancies. Nietzsche describes not only a transvaluation but a retrovaluation of worths, and Plato sketched a counter-world where all laws are reversed and time goes backward, or where men worship what they have burned and burn what they erstwhile worshipped, where truth becomes a lie and a lie truth, the hated are loved and the loved hated, the devil is God's ape, the witches' sabbath parodies the sacraments, and hell is a reflex of heaven. Contrasts and antitheses are tonics and stimulants. Here all this counterparting or dualism in both philosophy and the imagination is focussed down to a single scene setting this world over against the next. No one can doubt that the general view here illustrated has had the greatest social efficacy, and has not only made the hardest lots tolerable, but has provoked asceticism and every form of self-stupration. Hardship and pain have been wooed as muses, that by paralleling the state of Lazarus his fortune also might be ensured. Misery otherwise utterly unendurable has been borne, and instead of arousing reactions that nothing could resist has found vent in visions of compensating joy and glory. Crafty oppressors, temporal and spiritual, have used this reciprocity formula to cajole their victims. When a future of compensation has been doubted, and men have even begun to think this life perhaps the be-all and death the end-all, society has undergone its most radical revolution as a result, and priests and piety have fared hardest of all because felt to be arch-deluders. If death were the close, or the next world only a prolongation of this under similar circumstances or something yet more pallid like that of the Homeric shades, how different would have been the history of Christianity, how weakened the sense that justice rules the universe! Without heaven and hell the morality of all those ages when the chief motive of virtue was to escape punishment would have suffered, though perhaps such rewards and punishments have made men purblind to the

inner oracle and to the old Stoic ethics that virtue is its own reward and should be followed if it lead to the inferno. We should have had no Dante or Milton. Jesus far more than any other developed and gave the world a moral heaven and hell. He made them definite, real, longer, more durable, and more important than anything mundane, and if he had done nothing else than organize all the fragmentary superstitions of a life beyond the grave so as to utilize their combined power most effectively for good, what incalculable service to the race so long as and wherever this superstition exists! This sublime frescoing of the hereafter had most to do with bringing the barbarians into the Church. By itself alone it is perhaps the most stupendous work ever achieved by an ethico-religious genius. It has quickened sluggish consciences that nothing else could touch. No one who knows the human heart can have patience with those who, because there are a few pure and lofty souls that can live out the best within them without the aid of hope or fear for the future, argue that more harm than good was done by using these immense powers to stimulate righteousness and repress evil. Even a fear of fire scorching and crackling the flesh is needed for moral degenerates and perverts, and in all men the power of the boundless future and the long-ranged view of life, the standpoint of the hereafter, are all the better developed for this drastic pedagogy and all the traditions and theosophemes that are grouped about it. With all our boasted science the best of us are still more or less in the nursery-tale stage as to ethical values, and if these were only the black man and the goblins of childhood both their deterrent and stimulating influences would be in the right direction. What the world most needs is a fixed and indissoluble association in our very neurons between sin and shuddering horror, so that the nerves shall tingle and crepitate when we do or contemplate wrong. This is to fear aright. It is to have the strongest of all human impulsions, the dread of pain and disease, directed toward its chief cause. For the ethical psychologist the place or state of future weal or woe based on rewards and penalties is not a question of objective reality but of subjective need, and because he cannot doubt the latter he holds with regard to these beliefs a Kantian view that they do truly exist, since the practical reason is higher than the theoretical. If the latter doubts, the former, which is a higher tribunal, affirms, their unassailable reality for the will, and in this form they should be preached from the pulpit in new and stronger terms.[1]

Of these fifty-three parables, three seem marked by ignorance or error, viz., (7) what enters the body does not defile; (11) the eye filling

[1]See also C. G. Griffenhoofe: "The Unwritten Sayings of Christ." Cambridge, 1903, 128 p.; and especially L. E. Browne: "The Parables of the Gospels in the Light of Modern Criticism." Cambridge, 1913, p. 91.

the body with light; (48) the mustard seed becoming the greatest of trees; but still the meaning is clear and the moral remains unaffected. Some are obvious, if not almost commonplace, admonitions of ordinary worldly wisdom; like (6) the blind cannot lead the blind; (14) a tree is known by its fruit; (24) counting the cost before building; (26) agreeing with an enemy betimes; (27) taking the lowest place. Dearest of all adown the centuries are perhaps (35) the prodigal; (50) the good Samaritan. The danger of being too late is especially stressed in (40) the ten virgins, in (53) the rich man and Lazarus, and in several others. The efficacy of importunity stands out in (30) the friendly neighbour roused from bed; (31) the woman and the unjust judge. The largest number, however, are based on or connected with the rights and duties of tenants and landlord, e. g., (2) duty of unthanked servants; (13) serving two masters; (18) the loyal and the disloyal tenant; (19) sitting up late for the master of the house; (32) the usurer and the two debtors; (33) the pitiless servant; (37) the defiant tenant; (43) the unjust householder; while still others refer more or less to this relation.

This group of parables suggests from its closely related themes that Jesus' ideal in youth and in early manhood may have been that of being the lord of a manor; perhaps inviting guests to a feast; loaning out talents according to ability, with a definite theory concerning pay and the eleventh-hour labourers; abhorring usurers; counting the cost beforehand; demanding an undivided and also an absolute service; wise enough to build on a rock, and not on the sand; shrewd enough to be reticent in purchasing a treasure found in a field; interested in tares and wheat; an owner of sheep; pleasingly conscious that seed once sown grew while he slept; also with knowledge of the different kinds of ground; pleased when the fig-tree budded as a herald of spring, and condemnatory if it was barren; piqued if his dinner invitations were refused; issuing orders to brothers, one of whom obeyed and one of whom did not; welcoming a vagabond son back; yielding like Aristotle's magnanimous man to wise importunity; healing up quarrels quickly before lawyers and courts magnified them; using precautions against thieves; loaning money wisely; leading a life open as day, and with nothing in it to conceal, etc.

On this view the parables, which are so authentic and reveal to us so much of the soul of Jesus, suggest that his youthful dream was

to command servants, stewards, tenants; to be a master thrifty yet kind, wise in building, just yet sympathetic—in short, a noble country gentleman, a position Bismarck later called the finest on earth for the development of all-sided qualities of manhood, and the fullest of opportunity for the highest culture, the choicest virtues, and the greatest usefulness. Something like this was very likely the rôle Jesus came to fill in his own youthful reveries, and he lived sympathetically into this adolescent imagination far more fully than into any other. On this view, in the parables we see how he had idealized the opportunities and duties of some such position in life. This is borne out not only by the theme but by the lesson and meaning of the parables. Now as the "visions splendid" by which the youth had been attended were delayed in their realization and finally recognized as impossible of attainment, two diametrically opposite tendencies gradually supervened in Jesus' soul as a natural and inevitable consequence of his unconquerable and aggressive spirit. On the one hand he came to hate the rich who could have realized such ideals but whose interests had grown sordid; who failed even to see these opportunities, and who seemed to him both culpable and despicable because instead of making the very best, they made the worst use of their means. On the other hand, he came to aggrandize his dreams of living as a great country lord into being the head of a far greater Kingdom extending over all Israel, in which ideal conditions should prevail—a conception which the events of his life caused him to vastate and to sublimate until it began to take the features of a terrestrial if not a cosmic and heavenly Kingdom, partly realized on earth under his leadership. Thus, in a word, we find in the parables a psychoanalytic key to the secret of the evolution of Jesus' idea of the Kingdom, which was later developed as the Church visible and invisible. All this the world would have lost had he achieved in fact the day-dream of his youth. This processional of genius, doubtless more or less unrealized by him, he has unconsciously revealed in the parables, the theme of which thus constitutes an unwitting confession on his part as well as a series of admonitions. As prophets found their inspiration in days of calamity for which they over-compensated by portraying the glories of the future Zion, so the thwarted and repressed ambitions of Jesus' youth and manhood surged back and up into the inward realization of a new theocracy, and even a new paradise, in which his reign would be as benign as it was sovereign, and where

justice and mercy would be supreme. To this Kingdom nearly all the parables directly or indirectly relate.

It was a kingdom and not a democracy that Jesus would found, and most modern Christian socialists of the Rauschenbusch type seem quite to forget this. The political, industrial, social, and ecclesiastical institutions, as Jesus conceived them, were hierarchies stratified into ranks or classes from the prophet, priest, or king, down to the meanest and most menial servant whose sole obligation it is to obey and who has no claim even for thanks. Men could take, or were assigned, places high or low. Jesus never entirely outgrew the patriarchal idea. The head of his Kingdom was no constitutional monarch, but more like Plato's wise and good tyrant, or a father to all his subjects. All its citizens must love and serve one another, and be more than just, that is, merciful, to one another. Democracy existed before Christianity, and so did socialism and even communism. The Kingdom of the parables is no republic, though the fraternal bond of sympathy must exist not only between equals of the same station or caste but between all, high and low alike. If Christianity made each individual of transcendent value there remains, nevertheless, an uncalculated difference between the value of individuals even where degrees of merit are the same. Of course, if it is hard to harmonize the three synoptic Gospels, it is indefinitely harder to harmonize the teachings of the fifty-three parables. But their general drift and trend is unmistakable. If in some the Kingdom comes like a convulsion sweeping all away, in others it comes as gradually and naturally as the seed germinates. To some institutions it is like dynamite; to others it comes as rain or fertilizer. So, in our infinitely more complex civilization there are charitable, philanthropic, reform, and other efforts better and vaster, and there are also worse tendencies and institutions, than it ever entered into the heart of Jesus to conceive; but here and now, as there and then, there are, and should be, both catastrophes and benign evolution. There are still rank tares fit only for fire, growing with the wheat, ignorance, and superstition along with science and true culture, animality beside spontaneous spirituality. But although the perfect Kingdom as Jesus conceived it is still far from realized, there has been progress toward it since his day, and therefore the objurgations and condign sentences he pronounced upon the state of things he knew, it is only fanaticism or pessimism to apply without qualification to our

civilization to-day. Thus Jesus' youthful reveries of an ideal manor and its feudal lordship and its manifold orders of service, vast as it came to be in his mind as the months and years of his life went by, and far vaster yet as the conception of it has since become, have all attained reality enough to give the world its most precious hope as it continues to grow from age to age, although perhaps aeons yet must pass before it fills the earth.

CHAPTER TEN

THE MIRACLES

The higher criticism and miracles—Why Jesus became a miracle worker—(A) The healing miracles—Their technique and conditions—Their results—The first healing—Blindness and its symbolism—Deaf mutes—The lame—The withered hand—Dropsy—The epileptic at the synagogue—The pool of Bethesda—Possession—The demoniac in Gadara—Allegorization—Leprosy—Malchus's ear—(B) Resurrections—(a) Jairus's daughter and the youth of Nain as adolescent—(b) Lazarus—(c) Jesus' own resurrection—(C) Cures at a distance—(D) Nature miracles—(a) Cana and the symbolism of water made wine—(b) The miraculous draught of fishes—(c) The feeding—(d) Stilling the tempest—The psychology and pedagogy of the miracles from the standpoint of geneticism—The laminated soul—The miracles as sarcophagi.

AS TO the documentary evidence of miracles, the oldest Christian writings are the only undisputed epistles of the chief missionary, Paul, to the churches he founded at Corinth and Galilee and to the Petrine Church at Rome. These four seem to have been written from twenty-one to twenty-seven years after Jesus' death. Second comes Mark, thirty-five to forty years after the Crucifixion, which was compiled from earlier, chiefly Petrine, traditions. Third, and at about the same date, come the logia, lost but partially reconstructed, and containing chiefly Jesus' sayings. Fourth comes Matthew, 70 to 100 A. D., based on Mark and on the logia, but adding some new material. Fifth come two treatises written between 70 and 75 A. D., by a Greek disciple of Paul. The first is the Gospel of Luke, which sets out to be more complete, exhaustive, and scientific than those that had preceded, and the other is Acts, containing events from the narrow circle as Jesus left it up to the climax in the establishment of the Church at Rome, which utilized at least one older source. Sixth came a "mystical and devotional treatise on the Incarnation thrown into biographic form," which we know as the Gospel of Saint John, written probably

soon after the end of the first Christian century, or some seventy years after Jesus' death. All the Gospels were thus derived and edited compilations written from an older source (which can be traced back to probably from twenty-one to thirty-two years after Jesus' death), while our first three Gospels took form fifteen or eighteen years later, except John, which came about a quarter of a century later still.

As to the oldest source, Paul does not even allude to any miracles done by Jesus. The then-unwritten Gospel, as he knew it, consisted almost entirely of the story of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus. He knew little else concerning Jesus' life or teaching, nearly all of which was developed later. His detachment from this source was due to his absorption in the events of the last week of Jesus' career. The Gospels, giving Jesus' previous life, were from his point of view an afterthought. The supernatural elements Paul believed in were the gifts of the Holy Spirit, wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, prophecy, and tongues, more or less correlated with the ecclesiastical offices. Thus the authority that goes back nearest to Jesus' own day contains nothing more miraculous than faith healing, exorcism, etc.

As to Mark, while it gives more growth and unity, the chronology and selection of incidents are both somewhat perverse. The Church preceded the Gospels, and hence even Mark is more apologetic and theological than historic. Before he wrote, the word "gospel" meant a message to faith. Mark consists largely of Petrine traditions. Its author was probably John Mark, who came into contact with Jesus only during Passion Week, and whose house was afterward a meeting-place for the disciples. He also accompanied Paul on his first missionary tour, and he very likely came under Peter's influence later. Under the latter's influence he extended the life of Jesus backward beyond Paul's ken, and most of these additions could have been and probably were supplied by Peter. Thus we have in Mark two parts, first the events of the last week, which John Mark very probably saw at first hand and from which Paul started, and secondly the rival Petrine reminiscences of the previous career of Jesus. The miracle stories belong to the latter, and centre about Jesus' early period in Galilee, which is more obscure.

While some still dispute the existence of the above lost source, called "Q" (*Quelle*) or the logia, the Oxford students have sanctioned it, and Harnack has even attempted to reconstruct it in a document of

nearly two hundred verses, chiefly made up of Jesus' teachings. Besides these it contains only six incidents of which two are miracles, viz., the healing of the centurion's servant and the casting out of the dumb devil. Thus it is about as free from miracles as is the latter part of Mark; and both the above miracles are those of healing although one seems to be by a most mysterious action at a distance, which anti-supernaturalists think a coincidence and cite parallels.

Matthew used our Mark and "Q," and also added other material. Here detailed criticism shows that the only evidence of most of Matthew's miracles is Mark, and there are some traces, though very slight, of a tendency to exaggerate these. What he adds is least trustworthy.

Luke claims to have been written by an educated gentile companion of Paul, and marks a new stage of tradition. He assumes a new method, for he was not an eyewitness, and refers to the failure of other attempts by those who did not know Jesus at first hand. To this physician-evangelist Jesus is less Messiah than saviour and healer of the body and soul, and thus to the miraculous tales he brings no new evidence but various new motives. He does not omit any previous records on grounds of incredulity or lack of evidence, but amplifies and strongly emphasizes nearly all the supernatural events, and most of those which he adds are extremely marvellous and rest on hearsay and tradition as they had been developing for about twenty-five years.

John cares less for the facts than for their meaning. If the Gospel that bears his name was not written by him in his old age, reviving and embellishing old memories, it was doubtless composed by one or more authors who reached the facts through their faith rather than *vice versa* as with the synoptists. The farther we go back from the Passion Week, which has no miracles, the more miracles we find. In John, Jesus himself is miraculous. His story is of the Incarnation of a preëxistent divine person who as God's vicegerent had created the world that he now visits. He could supernaturally read the thoughts of all; he vanishes or passes mysteriously through crowds; he is a stranger to and quite aloof from the Jews. The divinity of the Johannin Jesus did not depend on supernatural birth, and so this is not mentioned. The judgment, too, is not impending, but came with the advent of the Paraclete. Of historic crises or developmental stages, such as the baptism, temptation, transfiguration, etc., which are marked in the synoptists, there is no trace; but Jesus is quite divine from the

beginning, and is thus independent of time and space. John's seven miracles are saturated with symbolism.[1]

The above represents in the barest and most summary outline the results of the higher criticism in their chief bearings upon the problem of miracles. It is precisely here, where these studies end, that the problem of geneticism begins, which is how and by what motivation did these few actual cures which Jesus performed come to be magnified into the prodigies recorded by the Evangelists, why are they so clung to, and what is their positive value and meaning to us? The higher criticism only informs, but does not edify. The religious instincts and needs can never be satisfied with negations. We accept all the real results of criticism, but charge it with blindness to deeper meanings. Thus religious psychology comes to the defense of miracles. They made the fortune of Christianity and are still precious to believers. Despite their historic falsity they have a high significance for piety and also for psychology, for they are made, warp and woof, out of soul-stuff and are thus in a sense both more valid and valuable than if they had been actually performed. What seemed their negation thus really rescues them to higher purposes, and from this standpoint they are invested with a new and hitherto undreamed-of truth. All religions have miracles, which are the dearest children of faith. Even the wildest of those in Brewer's "Comprehensive Dictionary"[2] are psychologically explicable and constitute valuable data for our science. But those that evolved in the early decades of Christianity are unique and in a class by themselves, because, from the psychogenetic viewpoint, false as they are, they are by no means mere creatures of imagination, nor products of superstition. They take us to the shrine of the inner life of Jesus, on which every one of them sheds light, and without which the world would never have realized much of the best that he was, did, and said. Let us, then, approach our problem by a few general considerations.

It was a peculiarity of the Jews that any great leader to be accepted must accredit himself by working miracles. Thus the great men of old had done. Thus only, too, could Jesus ever meet the popular ideals of a Messiah, or fit the specifications of prophecy as his biographers had a veritable passion for making him seem to do, often

[1] London, 1901, 582 p.

[2] This is well epitomized for our purposes in J. M. Thompson: "The Miracles of the New Testament." London, 1911, 236 p.

in very trivial details. Not only the multitude but the disciples again and again "desired mighty works" as a sign; but if they had not believed that he did miracles, it is very doubtful whether they would have recognized him as sent from God. In the first two so-called temptations he seems to have considered and definitely rejected this function; but the Pharisees challenged him to do them, the populace awaited them, and even the disciples assumed that he would do them. There were no hospitals or asylums, and the sick were all about, while the troublesome times preceding had produced, we learn, an exceptional number of neurotics and psychotics, so that every characteristic type of mental aberration was constantly met with. Every one assumed that a religious teacher must also exercise the functions of a healer. To this end the patients and their friends constantly importuned Jesus, while his closer followers were intensely prone to ascribe the natural stimulus of his presence, touch, or handclasp, or even the cases where the betterment was slight or temporary, to supernatural healing power.

This Jesus deprecated, and obviously sought to avoid the reputation of being a mere curer of the body. He often refused to attempt marvels, sometimes with evident resentment, and rebuked the spirit that demanded it. He told those who thought themselves cured to tell no man, commanded the evil spirits that would proclaim him to hold their peace, escaped when pressed by the crowd who sought cures, said to them who thought he had healed them, with equal truth and modesty, "Thy faith hath made thee whole." But he could not escape the superstition of his day. He must either accept the reputation of theurgic power or else abandon his divine mission. This seems the alternative, although we do not know how clearly and sharply it was present to Jesus' soul. How far the rôle of miracle-doer was forced on him by the pedagogic necessity of his day, and how far his intimates and biographers misrepresented him, we can never know. Perhaps the latter was true of the physical and more utterly unbelievable miracles, and the former of the more credible therapeutic marvels. To do the latter he was of course strongly impelled by sympathy with suffering and distress, and he also very clearly saw that these were the best symbols of just the spiritual work he sought to do, viz., to open the eyes of the spiritually blind and the ears of the deaf, make the lame walk, and bring health to the sick, if not life to the dead. Perhaps

he even learned to use some of the most fabulous nature marvels ascribed to him as parables, set in scene object-lesson-wise, of higher truths.

But if the repute of a wonder-worker made his success in his day and through the earlier centuries of Christianity, now we have to see and realize that the religion of Jesus is losing its hold upon the cultured world precisely because of the deeds imputed to him that made his early followers accept him. This crass literal interpretation is today the chief handicap that prevents the acceptance of his teaching or the admiration of his life. Our modern mind cannot worship without subtle psychological, even if unconscious, reservations, not to say stultification, a being whose claim rests upon multiplying loaves of bread, changing water to wine, walking on the water, raising the dead to life, healing instantly a group of lepers at a distance by a word, etc., for such things belong to the shadow-land of fiction and not to that of historic fact. The future of Christianity demands the emphatic and authoritative repudiation of such encumbering infantilism, necessary and inevitable as this was at the beginning of our era. Miracles will perhaps always have a high value as illustrations of the state and disposition of the mind of those nearest to Jesus and their successors. They are also serviceable as types of higher psychic meaning. But even the latter cannot be seen and felt until every vestige of the credulity that accepts them in any sense or degree, as literal, physical events, is purgated from the soul and our faith thereby made purer and clearer. Nothing would sweep away so many modern repugnances to Christianity as this complete katharsis of theurgy. None sin so grievously against the true spirit of the person and doctrine of Jesus as those who champion the effete orthodoxy that thus materializes the spiritual.

(A) *The Healing Miracles.*—P. Dearmer enumerates forty miracles of healing by Jesus in the Gospels. Of these twenty-one were recorded by one Evangelist, eight by two, eleven by three, and none by all. Matthew reports twenty-one, six of which are peculiar to him; Mark records eighteen, three of which are his only; Luke twenty-four, eight of which are peculiar to him; and the only four by John are mentioned by him alone. Keim's enumeration does not differ very much from this. As to the genetic order of the miracles it would be sad if we must indeed abandon all knowledge. The Gospels differ very widely in their sequences, and some writers now, according to

the fashion of certain ages in the past, have selected one or another Evangelist as the norm. Some group them by an artificial system that either ignores or disallows the historic process. Miracle cycles, too, are sometimes centred about the Galilean or Jerusalemic periods. We can distinguish by various attendant circumstances some four of them as early, and some six or eight as late in Jesus' public career; and on the cycle theory perhaps the greatest of them centre about the second of the periods, perhaps near its end. The Cana and Capernaum miracles, which the three synoptists placed first, many regard as parts of an artificial program.

The records in those Gospels supposed to have been written last do not suggest a gleaning of miracles hitherto unrecorded, but give abundant evidence that the miraculous element was on the increase. The same event is elaborated later, as if during the period between the first and the last even of the synoptists, the taste for the supernatural was growing. Thus, as we pass from Matthew or Mark to Luke and John, the demands on our faith are augmented. The diseases are of longer duration, and graver, the cure is wrought on more persons, and sometimes the point of death seems to have become death itself. The healing methods are more circumstantially recorded and thus often made more mysterious. Haupt gives an exquisite case of the growth of a Mohammedan miracle four times recorded. In the first the prophet at a certain point in his story rests under a leafy tree. In the second record, years later, he stands under it as if expectant of something supernatural. In the third Allah led him to the tree, while in the fourth he caused it to grow for the purpose. The many discrepancies in the parallel records respecting detail in the Gospels are very suggestive of growth, and yet the unanimity that is dominant furnishes now one of the chief arguments for a common source older than any of our Gospels. There is repeated allusion to a large number of unrecorded miracles, but if the source were unlimited there is reason to believe that those recorded would not so often be the same. Recent criticism holds that the actual authors of our Gospels were themselves in no case witnesses to the mighty works they describe. Some of them, at least, wrote after this source had for some time been dry. The double and triple narratives show how very fluctuating was the tradition, so that in several cases we are left in doubt whether the record is of the same or of different events. A few miracles are perhaps figures of speech, or parables taken literally, like the draft of fishes, or the threat

against the barren fig-tree which later appears as the stupendous miracle of its being withered at a distance by a curse. Some moral precepts may have been developed into a visible description, as if Isaiah's prophecy of the healing of the blind, deaf, lame, lepers, were factualized. Symbolic picture-stories undoubtedly exist, but not to an extent to justify Herder's belief that all the marvels were pictures of ideas. We have (1) sometimes a material event as a starting point, core, or minimum of truth at its lowest potence. Jesus often deprecates the lust for sensuous marvels because he wishes his truth to attain a higher power, and the difference of the spiritual meaning in the different synoptists accounts for some of their discrepancies. Thus we have (2) the meanings which are to be embodied, the stilling of the storm, e. g., by the captain who will bring the ship of the Church into a safe port, the blindness which is really of the heart, not of the eyes. (3) Another germ from which some of the miracles were developed is plainly traceable to the Old Testament, while others sprang from the psychic life of Jesus himself, who healed from sheer compassion. (4) Healing was one of the chief functions of the traditional Messiah and one of the signs by which he was to be known.

One centre of intellectual interest is *how* Jesus effects his healings. He often touches or lays hands upon the sick, lifts them up, anoints, uses saliva, puts his finger in the ear of the deaf mute, prescribes washing or bathing, takes his place at the side of or has him stand forth, inquires as if making a diagnosis, prescribes rest and diet. Paulus thinks he had all the medical skill of the Essenes and used their remedies. Others hold conversely that his reluctance to heal was due to his conscious lack of knowledge of the art and still others have urged that he yielded to pressure and acquired later some hasty knowledge of it. Venturini assumed that the disciples carried about a portable medicine chest. Some of Jesus' patients or their friends deemed manual contact especially efficacious, and it is the later records that amplify methods. Besides using the rationalists' herbs and tinctures Weiss thinks that Jesus was charged to an unusual extent not merely with animal but a higher personal magnetism of a peculiar kind, and develops the theory that the progressive loss of this by his cures, his mental activities, and his anxieties, caused his death. Gutsmuths thinks Jesus had a power of voluntarily transferring nervous force in some kind. Renan thinks some of the miracles deliberate jugglery justified

by their moral or pedagogic end, while Rothe postulated some as yet unknown but nevertheless natural force.

More potent than all these physical therapeutic agencies, unless it be touch alone, was the power of the spoken word: "Be thou clean"; "as thou hast believed"; "arise and walk"; "come forth"; "thou art loosed"; "stretch forth thy hand"; "take up thy bed and walk"; "thou art made whole"; "go in peace"; "sin no more"; "thy faith hath saved thee"; to the filthy spirit, "come out of him." Thus there was no set formula, but all these phrases show intense confidence and authority on Jesus' part, and this naturally inspired assurance or faith on the part of the patients. Sometimes it seems as if the whole energy of his soul went forth in such words, motivated by his indomitable faith in himself and his mission. This is more apparent in the later writings, indicating growth in the belief of some specific magical power. The word alone without physical manipulation is more common in Jesus' healing miracles than in those of the ancient prophets.

Again, cure presupposes not only a strong *desire* for it on the patient's part, but an intense *belief* that it will be attained. The sick crowd about Jesus or are brought by friends. They beg, cry out, fall down, or their relatives entreat for them. The centurion asked for only a word *in absentia.* Faith is shown in the many forms that this desire takes and is measured by the obstacles that are overcome. One is let down through the roof. The blind will not be silenced, but cry out yet louder. The woman for whom physicians could do nothing is certain Jesus can heal her. So great became his repute and fame that assurance in advance may have preformed or initiated the restorative work. On his part the chief demand was just this intense faith. "Do ye believe that I can do this?" "Be it according to thy faith." Where it is faint he encourages it in the germ by promises, and where it is absent he reproves. In faith on the patient's part he often sees the complete and sufficient cause of the cure, and without it he sometimes can or will do nothing. Like the physical agencies, it is, of course, possible that where not mentioned it is implied or presupposed. In one remarkable case he heals by forgiving sins. If the omission to mention faith is more frequent in the later Gospels, this may imply a growing belief in Jesus' own initiative, as if the human coöperation were increasingly felt to be subordinate, or as if to heal

without it meant more glory to the physician. This is the trend most marked in John. Faith of friends is often effective. The demoniacs felt instant alarm as if dimly conscious from afar of Jesus' power, and were both attracted and aroused to a high pitch of excitement by his very presence. They not only leave all activity to him but abjure him to depart, so that instead of coöperation of faith there is here intense resistance to be overcome, and yet there are traces of schizophrenia, for while the evil spirit that possessed them objected to the cure, the remnant of sanity that remained in them not only believed but desired it.

The *result* of Jesus' healing activity is instantaneous as well as sometimes telepathic. Cures were usually signalized by immediate and sometimes intense physical activity, and also by praising and proclamation. This of course intensified the impressiveness of the miracle; and if what we know of the effect of psychic trauma and shock detracts from the credibility of some of the cures, it certainly adds greatly to that of others. All the Evangelists imply that such events had never been known before, although they do not, Keim urges, intimate that they were in any case opposed to the unknown laws of man's higher nature. They were not investigators; and if they were credulous, this quality was the outcrop of just that belief that worked the cure. Thus the defects and exaggerations of the record permit our doubt as well as our faith. These writers used their reason upon their second-hand, but to their mind well-authenticated, data on which their conclusions were based. While Jesus certainly preferred to heal the soul rather than the body, he perhaps accommodated to the demands of those about him to be healed of diseases, because of a growing insight on his part into the closeness of the bond between the psyche and the soma, growing thus more completely into the sphere of interest of those about him. There has been much but vain discussion whether or not the records of his words and doctrines are more or less distorted than those of his deeds. Some have urged that these great works made the Incarnation more complete than if he had preached more and done less; but surely biographers are less liable to go astray in reporting the things done by those of whom they write than in setting forth their undocumented opinions, because in the latter the subjective factor would inevitably have more scope.

Padolean gathered many instances to show that a pure and

devoted life of sanctity not only has always been thought to have great therapeutic power, but in his opinion really has it, and to prove that a morally perfect life heals by infection quite apart from the natural influence of a magisterial will upon an oppressed one, and independently of any theory such as that the psyche is so bound up with the soma that to cure spiritual distempers the body must be first made whole. If faith meant to Jesus a summons that he could not resist, and if he had to heal by an inner necessity of his nature, as we are often told, then why is he represented as healing now with an almost Buddhistic calm and imperturbability, at another time as if with an outbreak of rage against Satan and his morbific agencies, and yet again as healing with sighs and groans as if beside himself, or in a nervous paroxysm, or making an intense agonistic effort? It is entirely impossible to correlate these differences of his attitude with differences in the nature of the disease or with the degree of illness of his patients. Moreover, now he represents his cures as God's work, and again as so genuinely human that his followers could even surpass him. He was as far as possible from any consistent theory or method, and we do not need to adduce Hume's theory that a miracle from its very nature is incapable of being proved because the best possible human testimony is less infallible than nature's laws. The evidence of the Gospel records of some of the miracles is not only impugnable but suspicious from every point of view. So flimsy, indeed, is it that it offers only a very poor pretext for the wish to believe to gratify itself, and yet this desire is often so strong, especially toward healing miracles, that even a hint suffices. Furthermore, the accounts of Jesus' healing activities are given a somewhat higher degree of plausibility in recent decades by psychotherapeutic studies, so that it is safer to assume in some of these instances a nucleus of fact than it is in the nature miracles. We now pass to the discussion of the chief individual miracles grouped into classes.[1]

The First Healing.—With four of his disciples then chosen, Jesus proceeded, directly after the temptation, to the home of Peter and Andrew, where the mother-in-law of the former lay ill of a fever, which most exegetes who have ventured any conjecture think probably, owing to the nature of the country and the modern health conditions there,

[1] C. W. Waddle: "Miracles of Healing." *Am. Jour. Psychol.*, 1909, pp. 219-268 (with an excellent bibliography to date). As a typical modern cure see Flournoy: "Une Mystique Moderne (Documents pour la Psychologie Religieuse)." *Arch. de Psychol.*, 1915, T.15, 224 p.

was malarial. Matthew says that Jesus went in and touched or took her hand in greeting, and she arose and ministered as housewife to her guests. Matthew's narrative is simple, human, and natural, the "cure" unintentional, and the result perhaps a little surprising to Jesus himself. The bystanders thought it marvellous, and the impression it made on them reflected into his own mind may have given him his first sense of power as a healer. The credulity of the town folk grew to a most embarrassing degree that day. Even the other Gospels show the beginnings of mythic accretion and elaboration. Luke and Mark add various items, e. g., of the guests. Jesus was told about the invalid, his aid was besought, the fever was said to be great, he rebuked the disease, lifted her up; the cure is said to be immediate. The later recorders evidently thought, as the Church has since done, that this was a miracle, and so very likely did the four companions of Jesus; but it is only honest candour and not carping to remember how many persons, and especially housekeepers, have responded to sudden calls made upon them as hostesses, to entertain distinguished people, and that while so doing they have forgotten all sense of illness. This woman knew, perhaps, that this was the master her son-in-law and his brother were to follow, and she naturally wished to send them off from this parting visit with pleasant memories, for there would be time enough to rest and recuperate when they were gone. Moreover, the very presence of the hero of the hour, as Jesus certainly was that day, and especially the impressiveness of his magnetic presence in itself—such things are often the best medicine. And, again, there was the added stimulus of an approaching throng.

As the sun was setting there were brought to Jesus at this humble home all the possessed and those with diverse other illnesses, and all the town gathered; and Mark says he healed many of diverse diseases and cast out many devils. Matthew says he healed all with his word, while Luke says he laid on his hands and healed every one, and many from whom devils were cast out acknowledged that their healer was Christ the Son of God. None remained ill in that region that night. Matthew even adds that thus a prophecy might be fulfilled to the effect that he took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses. This idea of prophecy-fulfilment is, of course, always suspicious because Jesus' feeling that he was fulfilling ancient predictions or decrees, imparted to his chroniclers, made them, however unconsciously, tend to fit their

records to these old vaticinations. In this thrice-attested twilight clinic we seem to have real healing power, of the genuine effectiveness of which, in view of so many modern instances, we need not be incredulous, although, as so often, the impression of it increases with the successive Gospelographers, Mark, as usual, being most temperate and Luke most prone to amplify without critical restraint. Mental healers of many types and theories, Emmanuelists and still better of late, men like Dejerine, Dubois, Marcinowski, and Rosenbach, have accredited the power of the soul to cure many of the ailments not organic or bacteriological, that it can make. Jesus' methods were more like those of a consummate medicine man, being chiefly without set method, but direct and immediate, and this had been an epoch-making day in his career which, had we its date, the Church would perhaps still celebrate. We have probably as yet by no means sounded all the powers and wonders that the imagination when strongly appealed to can work in casting off or defying disease, and we have still to lay to heart the lesson that even savage medicine, which this was far above, though in the same spirit, has yet to teach modern therapy. Finally, of no single day of Jesus' career, save only the second preceding the Crucifixion, have we so full a record, sketchy as it is.

Blindness.—Isaiah represents that the joy of being permitted to return from the Captivity was so great as to heal diseases. But as the prophetic program of a return and a re-establishment of the old glory of Jerusalem was not carried out, such expectation of cures of the blind, deaf, and lame, as he specifies, was extended on to the day of the Messiah. Hence, when Jesus was recognized as the Messiah, there was an accumulated store of expectation which constituted a large fund of popular faith for him to draw upon. The healing of prophecy was always and purely symbolically meant, but in the above process of postponement the conceptions of such cures were more and more grossly materialized. Hence such structures as the evangelical legends of healing were ready in a moment by a touch of suggestion to take on a literal form. Making the blind see in prophecy always meant spiritually, but the Evangelists interpret each miracle of this kind which they make Jesus perform as literal and sensuous. They not only often lack all spiritual insight themselves, even where this meaning is obvious, but sometimes take the very greatest pains that all be made to appear historical and physical only. In the story of the cure of the blind

man of Jericho, Luke, and still more Mark, add picturesque details which contribute to give it an almost Defoe-like verisimilitude. Mark, who began this materialization of psychic miracles, saw nothing else in them; but John, in whom this tendency culminated, sees also along with the natural a spiritual and ideal meaning. And it was the force of his conviction of the latter which impelled him to amplify and historicize the former. Jesus' life is the light of men. To the still incorrigible unbelief of the Jews, Jesus was come that "they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind," thus equating the two processes although he did not literally put out eyes, that is, he did no penal miracles of this kind. In the literature of modern psychoanalysis we do, however, have cases in which mental blindness is the result of the will or wish of the unconscious part of our nature converted downward into diseases of the eyesight, into which we take flight. John made his stories as real as testimony knew how to make anything in his day, because he dimly saw at the same time that the incidents were supercharged with symbolic meaning.

Thus, that the blind should be made to see is not only one of the traits of Isaiah's Messianic age, but it is the very life of the Logos-Christ who was the light of the world shining into a darkness that comprehended it not. Moreover, from the gnostics to Wundt's parallelism of perception and apperception, vision is the closest analogue of knowing. Visual imagery is one of the most inseparable elements of the higher thought processes, and blind-mindedness involves the gravest kind of mental imperfection. Thus it was nothing less than a foregone conclusion that Jesus, the great and good Lucifer or light-bringer, would have to be thought a healer of blindness. Indeed, from the imputation of this power he could not escape, however much he might desire to do so.

In the first or Bethesda cure of this kind (Mark only) a blind man was brought to (not sought by) Jesus, imploring him to touch him, in accordance with the widespread view that healing influences emanated from famous men. Jesus led him by the hand out of town, whether to make a better private diagnosis, or to make an unobserved experiment, or to keep the case a secret one, and spat in his eyes saliva, then thought in folklore to have great therapeutic power, instead of being deemed as now a prolific source of infection. Even yet saliva is a popular remedy in many lands for eye troubles. Jesus also laid his hands upon him

and asked him if he could see. He replied he could only see men as trees walking. After a second imposition of hands, however, we are told "he saw every man clearly," and was told to go home and say nothing of it in town. Rationalists have often objected that a second imposition of hands meant a limitation of the infinite divine healing power, and it is a fact that one element in the aggrandized cures which Jesus is reported to have wrought is that they were immediate and not like this in stages, as if in order for more effective demonstration. But the implication was that there were no spectators and that even knowledge of how the cure was wrought must have come from either Jesus or his patient. Perhaps, said Paulus, Jesus somehow manipulated out of his eyes some very aggravating dust or possibly some morbid growth that had rendered vision imperfect; or, says Venturini, he may possibly have removed a cataract with his fingernail, and perhaps he made two steps in the operation because, as we know now, to heal too suddenly would have been dangerous.

In the Jericho restoration from blindness recorded by the three synoptists, Matthew and Mark say there were two, while Luke says only one blind man, Bartimæus. Mark says it was on the way to, and Matthew and Luke say it was on the way from, the city. Mark makes his blind man arise and come to Jesus at his call, casting off his garments, and there are other discrepancies, although the weight of opinion is that we have here different versions of the same incident and not different cures. The blind men cried out to Jesus as son of David, and continued to do so all the more when told to hold their peace. Jesus asked what they wanted him to do. They replied, to restore their sight. Matthew says he pitied them and touched their eyes, while Mark and Luke say he pronounced them cured by virtue of their faith. Their sight was immediately restored, and they followed Jesus, and the people glorified God. Here nothing is implied of the nature or cause of the blindness, or how complete the cure was. This surpasses Elisha's removal of the penal blindness inflicted on his enemies as a result of his prayer. These patients not only wanted to be cured but had faith, neither of which is intimated in the Bethesda case. Venturini makes the gratuitous assumption that Jesus healed their eyes with a tonic lotion he carried to purge away the irritating dust which in those regions was so detrimental to vision. In both the above cases there is no hint of symbolic significance. The healing is a purely

physical restoration to sight, as marvellous as in the very few modern instances of restoration from congenital cataract by a surgical operation, although Jesus acts with none of the delicate apparatus or complex methods of procedure of modern ophthalmology.

As in the series of three resurrection narratives, as we shall see, so here John caps the climax by a third which is far more wonderful and better attested than any other, as if to make all others superfluous. This patient is blind from birth. As if referring to an even-then-current belief that the blindness of the newly born was due to parental infection, Jesus was asked whether in this case the affliction was due to the sin of his parents or to himself (as if congenital disease could be due to any sin of its unfortunate victim). Jesus replied that neither had sinned, but that this patient was born thus in order that in his cure the divine power might be shown forth. For this reason the blind man was not brought to but discovered by Jesus, who, stating that he was the light of the world, made a mixture of clay and spittle and applied it, telling the man to go wash in the pool of Siloam, which meant "sent," as he was sent. This he did and came seeing. Here we are told of no petition to be cured either by the patient or his friends, but the restitution to sight seems to have been made on Jesus' own initiative. The scene of this miracle is placed in Jerusalem also on the Sabbath and as if to make this only case of healing blindness which John records a perfect and unimpugnable bit of testimony, the restored patient is made the subject of a formal and rather elaborate hearing. First came the question of identity. Some said it was the blind beggar that they had often seen, and others were not sure of anything more than a resemblance; but he declared, "I am he." Interrogated as to how he was cured, he replied by telling just what "the man called Jesus" had done, and how he washed and saw. He was asked where Jesus then was, but did not know. Next he was taken to the Pharisees, who asked the same and received the same response. They wrangled, some thinking that the healer could not be of God or he would not have violated the law by healing on the Sabbath, while others maintained that no sinner could perform such a cure. The patient was again asked what he had to say of his curer, and he replied that he was a prophet. Doubting whether he had really been born blind, his parents were summoned, and they testified first that he was their son and second that he was born blind. But in this affidavit they averred that they

did not know who opened his eyes, and advised that the son be asked for he was of age, because, knowing that any one who confessed Christ would be excommunicated, they were afraid. They were thus made unwilling witnesses, and hence all the more credible. Again the patient was called and told to praise God though he had been cured by a sinner, to which he stoutly replied that whether his healer had been a sinner or not mattered not to him. He only knew that whereas he was blind he now saw. Told again to describe his cure, he refused, asking tauntingly if they intended to become Jesus' disciples. They replied that they were disciples of Moses, but that he was a disciple of Jesus, adding that they knew not whence this fellow Jesus was. The patient, however, averred that Jesus must be the Son of God for since the world began no one ever heard before of a cure of congenital blindness. For his temerity in thus taunting them the patient was called a sinner and expelled. Then Jesus sought him, asking if he believed him to be the Son of God. "Who is that?" the man asked; and when Jesus replied, "I am he," the man believed and worshipped. Jesus declared that he came "that those who see not might see and those which see might be made blind." "Are we then blind?" asked the Pharisees, and they were told that if they were blind they would have no sin, but because they see their sin remains. Then after a Johannin discourse the Jews are left, still disputing, some saying that he was a devil and mad, and others saying that a devil could neither discourse as he had just done nor cure the blind.

These three are the chief and only circumstantially described accounts of healing blindness, although Jesus is elsewhere represented as healing many other cases. The case John reports is the *chef-d'œuvre.* He attests the literalness of the cure far more effectively than the synoptists do theirs, but he, unlike them, also sees its symbolic significance. To any oculist or ophthalmologist any and every such cure is too preposterous to be for a moment considered. Neither atrophied centres, optic tracts, the retina, nor diseases of the anterior media in the bulbus, can be made normal without long treatment or very delicate operations. Hysterical or functional blindness like Paul's of course may be overcome perhaps spontaneously, but this is contra-indicated here and would be no miracle. We have the rationalistic explanation that Jesus knew the secret of spectacles and carried in his medicine chest, that Paulus thinks was always present, an assortment of glasses; and he

holds that the stories we have are only an exaggerated account of thus remedying myopia, which is now exceptionally common among the Jews, and perhaps was then. This, indeed, is hardly more absurd than to say, as one commentator does, that as glasses are made of silica, the account of mixing saliva and clay was the best account John knew how to give of what Jesus really did, viz., making glass and fashioning it into lenses on the spot.

True miracles are things which are absolutely false. They never happen. There are of course phenomena of a higher order than what is yet known; but they are not these, for these are only fabrications, and that of a low order. Forever grateful as the world must be to the authors of the four Gospels (for they constitute by far the best part of the New Testament), their merit does not consist in themselves, for they did not write infallibly and had no inspiration save that which came from the exalted and inspired character who was their central theme. They give us well-meant and painstaking reports of the most impressive life that the world has contained. Compared to their theme and task, their intelligence and performance are wretchedly inadequate and often misleading. If their blindness had been removed how much more precious their records, for to see Jesus through them is to see through a glass darkly.

Why, then, the persistent credulity of so many who should know better concerning this class of marvels? The answer is, because these records are so overdetermined by the higher meanings which they embody. The teachings of Jesus are so illuminating that once to understand them is like light banishing darkness. One who has really accepted the rule of service in place of the rule of self is like a being restored to sight. The ethical and altruistic viewpoint is so like a new morn that there is no possible symbol so pat and apposite to express it as the restoration of the master sense. Jesus is the great opener of the inner eyes to the loftier power of spiritual truth, and the believer materializes this unique and only fit metaphor of the new life. He takes it literally just so far as he has not yet grasped the meaning of the higher illumination it stands for. These miracles are cryptograms which most of us cannot yet fully decipher, but which, when once they have delivered up their message, will be of no further value. The only definition of light is the excitation of the optic nerve. Now suppose there were no eyes in the world, and that at a certain stage

of evolution eyes suddenly came into existence; with them would of course be born all the phenomena of the visible universe, its colours, shades, contours, perspectives, etc. These miracles thus would be the best illustration and fittest for general currency of the new psychic world which Jesus' doctrine revealed. Such cures, therefore, are only parables misunderstood as history. They are degraded, and as it were fossilized, because their significance has been lost or dimmed. Thus it is the literal believer who is blind and in need of this cure. They are vessels of vulgar clay, precious only because of their content and useless when it has been appropriated. Their perennial lesson to us is that there is a higher life, more intense, efficient, and ecstatic, viz., that of self-sacrifice and of serving instead of ruling, loving instead of hating or fearing; a life that is to our present one as wine to water; as crawling about near the bottom of this dark and dirty sea of air is to Plato's empyrean ether above in which the gods lived; as health is to disease; as strength is to weakness; as winter to summer; as death to resurrection; or here, in a word, as darkness is to light. These are the meanings that have kept alive the bizarre fantasy of this type of cure, and the very power of persistence of so preposterous a tale in this civilized age is a witness which only the psychoanalyst can rightly evaluate of the high potential current of meaning that flows through it.

As a lofty and intricate building needs a more solid foundation than a cheaper one, so the miracles became in the folk-mind more crassified than the parables, simply because they have more to support and because their meaning is more fundamental and generic and more focussed on the one central theme, while the parables are more specific and detailed in their meaning. Every miracle stands for a more cardinal truth than any parable. The one and the same general truth to which every miracle points is a higher, more evolved superman state, a more socialized condition farther on in the developmental scale, while the parables are devoted to specifications concerning attitudes and conduct or doctrine ancillary to the supreme lesson of the Kingdom.

Deaf mutes.—In the Gospel Greek the same word means deaf and dumb, but only Mark connects them: Matthew and Luke represent Jesus as speaking in his answer to the emissaries of the Baptist only of cases of deafness, while in their own accounts they speak only of dumbness restored to utterance. Matthew (only) tells the tale of a man brought to Jesus with a dumb devil, which was cast out and he spoke.

The multitude wondered, for "it was never so seen in Israel," while the Pharisees said he cast out devils by their prince, Beelzebub. Then Jesus went "to all cities and villages" preaching and "healing every sickness and every disease among the people."

In another, or some think a different, version of the same case, Matthew tells of a man blind and dumb who was restored, and the people asked if this did not show that Jesus was the son of David. In Luke's amplified account Jesus replies at length to the charge of casting out devils by Beelzebub, by saying that if he did so Satan's house would be divided against itself and would fall; also, if he can do so he must be mightier than Satan to spoil this strong man's house. He tells of an unclean spirit evicted and restlessly roving till it finds its old habitation purified and then it returns, taking with it seven other vile spirits. To those who do not desire to multiply miracles more than is necessary, as the scholastics before Occam did entities, it may be noted that the fact and nature of the illness, the association with sin, the controversy with the Jews, the presence of the crowd, the approximate stage of Jesus' ministry in which the event occurred—all these are the same in both. If the two are different cases their similarity suggests stereotyped forms of apperception and description, while if they are different versions of the same cure, very great liberty in the treatment of fact and fallibility of human testimony is indicated. Woolstan and Paulus crudely interpret the Johannin account as of a slothful impostor or malingerer whom Jesus detected and sent away. The disease was evidently not grave enough to have affected the invalid's mind, and functional paralysis of hypochondriacal and hysterical origin is often overcome by stimulus or excitement strong enough to arouse dormant volition, as the crutches for centuries hung up at many a shrine bear witness.

Another patient whom Matthew calls a lunatic and also possessed, as Luke, too, does, Mark calls also deaf and dumb. Here the disciples fail, and Jesus goes to their aid and calls the deaf and dumb spirit out of the man, a cure mentioned elsewhere among those of the possessed. Mark (only) tells of a deaf man with an impediment in his speech whom Jesus took aside, put his fingers in his ears, spat, touched the tongue, looked up, sighed (as he did elsewhere only in raising Lazarus), and said a talismanic Aramaic word, *Ephphatha*, be opened, and straightway the string of his tongue was loosed, his ears were opened,

and he spake plainly. Charged not to tell, he told all the more, and the people said of his healer that he "hath done all things well; he maketh the deaf to hear and the dumb to speak," just as prophecy expected of the Messiah.

Here again it seems almost remissness and also somewhat out of character that the Johannin Jesus, who was the living word or divine *Logos*, does no miracle of this kind. Perhaps John, whose Christ did so completely all that symbolism required, thought that curing the defect or loss of audition was so obvious and elemental an act and so charged with symbolism concerning mental deafness to spiritual truth, that it was quite superfluous and that such cures could be assumed. Others have said that perhaps John on the other hand underestimated the value of volubility, preferring a laconic yea and nay. To Jesus, hearing the word meant doing it; and for him, unlike Plato who thought knowing half way to doing and therefore good in itself, hearing without doing augmented guilt. To more insightful miracle-makers the removal of deafness would mean augmented power of understanding, such as faith gives, while the removal of dumbness would mean power to proclaim the new salvation. Their first act was to disobey the injunction of silence by an uncontrollable impulsion to use their newly acquired power of speech, the use of which on any other theme would betray the fact that they were restored to the world of sound and phonation. Of the phenomena following complete restoration from utter and congenital deafness we know nothing, for there is no such case on record; but this would be a no less eloquent simile of the birth of a new and higher mental function of comprehension than restoration from total blindness. Had these patients been long quite deaf they would of course have lost in a corresponding degree the power of speech, so that the parabolic scope of these cases is limited. On the whole, there is somewhat more probability of a germ of material happening here than in the blindness cures, although there is an uncritical exaggeration, and no gleam of suspicion on the part of the narrators of any higher meaning.

The Lame.—Isaiah said that in that day "the lame man shall leap as a hart," and cures of palsy, paralysis, and cripples were to be expected in the process of validifying the new dispensation. The muscles are the organs of the will and have done everything man has accomplished in the world. Loss of the power of free, voluntary movement

hampers the passion for power and brings in its place a sense of weakness, which is proverbially miserable and has its own type of pathos and its own copious higher symbolism for whatever of the many types of lameness clinical diagnosis distinguishes. Thus, artistic and pedagogic as well as pragmatic tendencies could not fail to work unconsciously if not purposively to give us specific cures by the great physician of these very numerous, but, of course, in the Gospels not well differentiated, classes of cases.

All three synoptists, in ways the discrepancies of which as usual clearly show developmental stages, tell of Jesus preaching to a crowd that flocked from far and near. It was so dense that the four bearers who had brought the palsied man to him had to mount the flat roof and break it open so that they could let down the patient on his bed. This show of faith pleased Jesus. Strangely enough, as if recognizing a case of luetic tabes, and anticipating modern medicine, he thought the disease due to infection from a sex disease and so first of all pronounced the patient's sins forgiven. Accused by his enemies of blasphemy in arrogating to himself the power of forgiveness of sin, which belonged to God alone, he gave them to understand that this first phase of the miracle was harder than to cure the disease, and we are almost given the impression that the latter was the extemporized result of an afterthought to silence those who objected to his act of pardon. So the patient is told to arise and go home. This he did, carrying his bed, and glorifying God as did the crowd, which we are left to imagine parted to let the erstwhile bedridden victim of sin pass. Here Jesus not merely prevented but removed the slowly developing pathological results of a sin as if he were remitting a penalty, thus interfering with the normal moral order of life. If the disease was of syphilitic origin he created a fiat immunity as lord of bacteria, thus outdoing Beelzebub, the god of flies. Jesus, all agree, came to redeem the world from sin and provide a way of remission, ransom, and atonement, so that having sinned, a man may again be restored to righteousness and purity and escape the otherwise inevitable punishment. The world, it was assumed, was under a curse, which Jesus makes void by providing a way of escape. This is the chief theme of Paul, but the effects of this salvation, although inwardly so transforming, become chiefly apparent in the next life. This metamorphosis of regeneration needed to be figured and objectively demonstrated *ad oculos* by a

salient and ostensive instance, and also to be made more manifest by appearing instantaneously. How could even a modern symbolist devise a more apt, striking, and portable fable of the new life? for we are now very near the focus of the Christian consciousness. If it was progressive paralysis or paresis, an incurable germ disease of which only a fatal termination can be prognosticated, Jesus here not only suspended but reversed the law of cause and effect and wrought the only cure of this disease in the New Testament. The implication that, if he can forgive sinful acts that bring disease, he can far more easily and on the instant efface the bodily ravages of the infectious *bacilli* and toxins, is obvious, for are not all the hundreds of diseases now listed the results of sin, either personal or ancestral? His Kingdom is that of Hygeia, morally and therefore physiologically perfect. He is thus documented as the Divine Biologos, in whose presence lethal agencies are obviated. The very word "health" means wholeness or holiness, and all morbific agencies must flee if his attention is once focussed on them. In the Kingdom all sickness is driven away, and the fond dream-wish of the folk-soul to be completely and superlatively well is realized in a way beyond the wildest dreams of modern Christian Science.

The Withered Hand.—The three witnesses again tell of the man with the withered hand in the synagogue on the Sabbath. Knowing that he was watched to see whether he would heal him on the holy day, Jesus made the patient stand forth and asked the people whether one should not lift a sheep out of a pit and save life rather than kill, do good rather than evil, on that day. There was no answer. Then at his command the man stretched forth his hand and it was whole like the other. The Pharisees then took counsel how to destroy him, not for healing but for doing so on the Sabbath, so strict were their laws and customs on this point.

This miracle is less striking than its Old Testament precedent. Jeroboam stretched out his hand against Elijah, and it stiffened so he could not draw it back till, at the prophet's prayer, this penal miracle was set aside by a second miracle of grace. We are not told whether the cure meant power to move the hand, or whether instantaneous restoration of the atrophy was involved. The latter would mean that the shrivelled member grew suddenly in size, weight, and fulness, as well as came under the power of the will. Such growth would involve regeneration of tissues and might make this in a certain sense

analogous to the miracle of the multiplication of loaves. If the affliction was merely hysteroid, the cure has abundant parallels and was no miracle but an unusual restoration misinterpreted. But, if instead of being sprain, rheumatism, or inflammation, all of which have been suggested, it was unilateral wasting with atony or contractures involving both cerebral and trophic nerves and gradually bones, after a long train of symptoms according to modern pathology,[1] then this instantaneous reversal of a long train of degenerate and necrotic processes was a little like resuscitation, not of the whole body but of the limb only. The more we know of the nature of this disease the more impossible is it to conceive any such cure.

Dropsy.—Again, in the house of a chief Pharisee was a man with dropsy; and again Jesus, knowing he was watched, asked if it was lawful to heal on the Sabbath, and repeated the query, if an ox or ass fall into a pit should he not be rescued on the Sabbath? But there was no answer. So Jesus healed his patient and let him go. This trouble was in some sense the reverse of atrophy. There are, however, practically the same objections and the same defense, and the difficulties and possibilities of the two cases are analogous.

The Epileptic at the Synagogue.—In another Sabbath healing (like the above, in Luke only), a woman who had been bowed (some think a hunchback) for eighteen years was healed by imposition of hands and pronouncing her cured, and she became at once straight and glorified God. The ruler of the synagogue protested that there were six other days in the week, in any of which cures should be done rather than on this day. Jesus replied calling him a hypocrite because he who would water his own stalled cattle on the Sabbath was less kind to his fellowman. Much more should a daughter of Abraham, bound by Satan, be loosed. At this Jesus' enemies were ashamed, while the people rejoiced.

The Pool of Bethesda.—John (v:1-16) caps the climax in this series of miracles. The scene is brilliant, at the pool of Bethesda (to the existence of which scholars find no other contemporary allusion, and which may be a purely imaginary place). Here it was not only on the Sabbath but in Jerusalem and at a feast. It seems to have been a kind of hospital-theatre with five halls (which some think analogous to the five Books of Moses), full of patients with diverse diseases. An angel occasionally troubled the waters (as geysers spout and bubbles often arise periodically

[1] Osler: "Principles and Practice of Medicine." 5th ed., p. 928 *et seq.*

from mineral and aerified springs), and whoever stepped into the water first, after one of these visitations, was healed, whatever his disease. It was, therefore, a very popular curatorium in which the healing seemed to come directly from heaven. Here Jesus found a man infirm, not for eighteen but for thirty-eight years (the same number of years in which the children of Israel wandered in the desert). As he lay there Jesus asked him the superfluous question "Wilt thou be made whole?" and was answered that when the waters moved there was no one to put him in, and others stepped down before him. Jesus commanded him to arise, take up his bed, and walk, which he straightway did, when Jesus quietly left the multitude. The Jews told the patient that he had violated the Sabbath law in carrying his bed, and he defended himself by saying that the healer commanded it. Asked who had cured him, the deponent replied that he knew not. But Jesus met him later in the temple and commanded him to sin no more lest a worse thing befall him. Then he knew it was Jesus, and so informed the Jews, who sought to slay him because he had healed on the Sabbath, although the angel who troubled the waters was doing so.

Working on the Sabbath to John seems to symbolize the never-resting activity of his Logos-Christ. The defense for so doing in his miracle is drawn from the bucolic exigencies of pastoral life. Even a citation of David eating the shewbread of the temple, which was set apart for the priests, is not quite in point, but what is shown forth is the incessant creative, regenerative, divine power. Thus John's story of the cure of a bedridden man is, like his narrative of the blind man and the raising of Lazarus, the superlative instance of the series, but this has the most gorgeous scene-setting of any miracle of Jesus. The latter now and here triumphantly demonstrated his ability to give strength to the weak.

If the therapy of the agitated water be interpreted as a natural tonic bath, Jesus here shows his *vis creatrix* to be vastly superior to that of nature, and, if it was the work of an angel, superior to his. By dramatically selecting one patient from the large number and signalizing his case by an immediate and complete cure, he must have excited jealousy and envy in the other visitors at this spa. If he had merely enabled him to enter the pool he would have in a sense seemed ancillary to a superior healing power, and we should have had here two miracles instead of one.

The meaning which this crude fable embodies, and which is the soul that has kept its body with all its grotesqueness and deformity alive, is the precious symbolization of the truth that with God we are strong, and without or against him we are impotent. Iniquity saps strength, weakens will, while righteousness breaks the bands of sin, reinforces volition, and gives a strength not our own. With the divine powers we can become energumens so potent that by comparison our former strength, though normal, would seem weakness. Free will is hobbled by inhibitions and repressions like an athlete threatened with abulia. Here Jesus is made the emancipator of the shackled will, and puts "I can" in place of "I cannot," closes the chasm between desiring and accomplishing wherein so many lives are wrecked, restores lost control over the voluntary muscles and body movements; for, as Pindar says, only strong muscles can make men and nations great and free. Strong himself from his vocation, Jesus wanted his followers to be so, but they must be athletes of the new and higher life, capable of forming, holding, and executing the great purposes of the Kingdom. Strength always had and always will have its votaries, its heroes, its thrilling incidents, and its religion, and cannot be fitly served by weaklings, for only the power of the normal will makes us complete men. These cures thus are only ancient fossils of what we now call the gospel of efficiency, and therefore they will long remain precious things in the reliquary of orthodoxy because there will always be those who have suffered arrest on the lowest rungs of the ladder that leads from sense up to spiritual comprehension. Thus men may be endowed with power from on high that makes the weak mighty, the feeble strong. Every lesson emanating from Jesus teaches man's higher power, now of insight, as in the blindness cures; now of vitality, as in the Resurrection narratives; here of ability to do. We are all asthenic, or living far below our maximum output of energy. The moral here is of works, not of knowledge. Ethically we are all lame, crippled, paralytic, bound by Satan. We would be more chaste in thought and life, more temperate, enterprising, industrious and less idle or lazy, more altruistic and less selfish, more mindful of the supreme ends of life unless distracted by irrelevancies and details. Such are the sermons in these fossil stones.

Possession.—Possession was to a great extent a new idea among the Jews in Jesus' day, and there are relatively few traces of it in the Old

Testament. It had, however, developed rapidly under the influence of Babylon and the Parsee dualism, as Azel, Ahriman, Asmodeus, and demons that bring disease, pain, terrify, and enter living men and animals. Exorcism, however, though a recent importation into Judea from the East, was preformed and rooted in the old pre-Semitic Akkadian consciousness. Beelzebub's minions especially seize, tear, strangle men, make them cry out, roll, foam; and seven, or even a legion, may take up their abode in the same person, although, Hausrath thinks, only successively. If expelled they must wander to and fro, enter into unclean beasts, haunt tombs or deserts, or else return to their gloomy abode in the nether world. Although they cling with great tenacity to their human abode, they do not spare, but strain and wrench, and may destroy it. It is they who make men blind, deaf, dumb, deformed, or may indwell with no external manifestations save bad conduct. Jesus doubtless held this view, and did not merely accommodate to it, as Schenkel said.[1] Jesus undoubtedly believed himself in such cases to be face to face with Satan's house, and that the spoliation of it meant so much more ground won for the Kingdom of God, and held that every such cure advanced the day when Satan would himself be bound. Yahveh and Satan were fighting face to face with the human soul as their battle-ground. Jesus' cures in general differed from those of his disciples and of the Church later in that he discarded washing, fasting, fumigation, ceremonial methods of dispossession. He needed no consecrated oil nor water, no incantation, music, magic stones, formulae, binding, nor any other of the methods of the Jewish exorcists which Josephus enumerates. Some of the healing miracles of this class we can now accept, while others once thought marvellous can hardly seem so to us. The evil spirits regarded Jesus' very proximity as the harbinger of their expulsion. They often knew him from afar

[1]Even in our own day exorcism seems to be sometimes effective as a psychotherapeutic method. See, e. g., "The Treatment of Insanity by Exorcism," by Dr. G. Williams, London, 1908; also "Body and Soul," by P. Dearmer, New York, 1909, 426 p. Here also one might consult the records of Emmanuelism in this country, as briefly stated in Weaver's book, "Mind and Health," New York, 1913, 500 p. For the much further developed scientific applications of psychotherapy there is not only the literature of the Freud school, but see more specifically J. J. Dejerine and E. Gauckler's "Les manifestations fonctionnelles des psychonévroses; leur traitement par la psychothérapie," Paris, Masson, 1911, 561 p.; Paul Dubois, "The Psychic Treatment of Nervous Disorders," Trans. and ed. by S. E. Jelliffe and W. A. White, New York, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905, 466 p.; and J. Marcinowski, "Der Mut zu sich Selbst; das Seelenleben des Nervösen und seine Heilung," Berlin, Salle, 1912, 400 p. See also Rosenbach's Works. These methods are now multiform, and besides the records of them in the memorabilia of the synoptists there are twenty more records of marvellous healings in Acts, and a long list of them in the early Church from Justin the Martyr (d. 163 A. D.) to Sozomonus (d. 450 A. D.). Dearmer traces the record from St. John of Beverley, 731, to Father John of Kronstadt, 1908, and has much to tell us of places like Lourdes, Holywell, etc., urging that stigmatism is natural, etc. The method has fallen into disuse because it was thought to be miraculous, although in fact it is in no sense so, but many of the cures are genuine, natural, permanent. A number of regular physicians who do not themselves believe in prayer advise it to their religious patients, e. g., as a soothing and sleep-bringing agency, and a building has even been recommended where methods of exorcism could be made impressive, to which certain patients would be likely to respond. Should some such scheme prove even more effective than its advocates hope, it would hardly surprise the psychogeneticist who realizes how strongly man's past still grips his unconscious life. If a patient thinks he has a devil, perhaps the physician might with profit humour his illusion and call to the devil as if he were real, to come out of him.

and entreated him not to molest them. He suffered them not to speak, and his procedure was probably more effective because it was simple. The fame he early acquired, his magnetism, poise, confidence, authority, manner, broke mental fetters, stimulated dormant selfhood, aroused healthful reaction, gave new and supplanting thoughts, freed the enslaved imagination, broke the power of fixed ideas, changed the current of diseased wills, and made him a master in this field of moral psychotherapy from whom, with our conceptions of the fatalistic dominance of somatic and also hereditary influences, we have still much to learn. Despite all the diversities and credulity of the recorders, Jesus' achievements in this domain are one of his chief trophies and most potent suggestions to the world, and there is something here which the most inexorable criticism must leave essentially intact. These mysterious cures in his day excited more wonder and awe than anything else he did or said, and were one of the chief causes of the envy of the Pharisees. It was this class of which the early Church boasted, which had much to do with its spread, and which involved a kind of intensity of soul emitted by the energumens of the Church. They would also give him immense repute and authority over the world of souls in general, and would inconceivably reinforce all his nterpretations of all things of the soul. They documented him, too, as one to whom the devils did homage, so that thus he has a message perhaps not yet entirely appropriated by the Church or by modern medicine. He stands for the salvation of the body as for that of the soul, and would doubtless have understood something of our own theories of the undersoul and of the efficiency of relics, pilgrimages, and shrines.

First on this list comes the doubly recorded and very characteristic second miracle of healing, with a most dramatic setting. Jesus taught or preached with great power one Sabbath in the synagogue. The congregation marvelled both at his doctrine and at his original autodidactic way of setting it forth. Although we have no intimation of the theme of his discourse, he evidently did not give a mere exegesis of even the greatest of the prophets but, though he may have cited them, spoke on his own authority as if independently commissioned by Yahveh, and even went distinctively beyond the greatest of his predecessors. Perhaps this was his very first setting forth of his new-found insights and attitude to the universe, and the first fresh, condensed, germinal expression of his new conviction which was set forth more

fully in his later words and deeds. Would that the world had some record of this utterance! The authoritativeness with which he seems to have spoken may have been a little intemperate or brash, like the extravagant zeal of a new convert. "It hath been said by this or that prophet, priest, or king of high degree of old, but I say unto you thus and so," as if very obviously he felt himself to be greatest of all; and yet the worshippers seem to have been spellbound, awed, and delighted. When he had finished, or perhaps in the very midst of his sermon, an excitable epileptic became unable longer to contain himself. Accepting the belief that his own attacks were the invasion of a Satanic personality, as all others, Jesus included, did, he cried out *in propria persona diaboli* and as representing all his fellow evil spirits from the pit, "Let us alone, do not destroy us, we know thou art the Christ, the holy one of God." This made a thrilling, significant, and utterly unexpected situation. The devil had erstwhile sought in vain to tempt Jesus. Now his minions openly recognized and acknowledged him, and still more significantly, they were the very first to do so. It was now open war between the Divine and the powers of darkness. The two supreme potencies that in the Persian-tinged dualism of that day and land were always arrayed in strife, one against the other, were now face to face, each knowing its adversary. In the cry of the demoniac there was also a note of fear and dismay, even more than of defiance, as if the demons were reminiscent of the long-ago expulsion from heaven of the cohorts of Satan, and as if now they feared eviction from the domain of earth, which had hitherto been freely allowed to them. Jesus and all his friends and acquaintances doubtless believed that at this crucial moment he stood face to face with a representative of the great enemy. Here and now the war between the two kingdoms was joined, a warfare still hotly waged and unconcluded. This type of insanity is very generally thought to be the devil's inspiration, the diametrical opposite and counterpart of that brought by the Holy Ghost. The theopneustic man stands over against the diabolopneustic *Convulsionnaire*, a little as if the contestants represented, one all the celestial and the other all the infernal agencies in the world. The type of the victim's attack seems to have been ideally fitted for the kind of clinical demonstration dramatically needed. There was first a coherent and purposive exclamation involving full recognition of the Divine Physician, as if the Christhood of Jesus had been convincingly

demonstrated to an insightful mind in which, at the onset of the aura, the attack took the form of extreme if not clairvoyant lucidity. Perhaps in his normal state the patient had been instructed and possibly expectant, and the sudden impulse to cry out even in such an environment, when it became overmastering, was recognized as a warning that the convulsion was coming. Jesus showed no trace of the profound inner satisfaction which later was so apparent when Peter recognized his Christhood, but commanded that the unclean spirit hold his peace, as if he shrank from being recognized publicly and proclaimed for what he was and for what he had come to know himself to be. Then he ordered the demon to come out of the man, which it did only after he had cried out and fallen in convulsions. The fit had spent its force, and the patient doubtless lay quiet, limp, and comatose in the characteristic post-epileptic state. The awe and fame of this power to command devils shows that those present thought this a miraculous cure. The record itself, however, as it stands, asserts no psychotherapy of any kind. While Jesus' preaching may have precipitated the attack by its incitement and tension, the latter would normally have ended as it did if Jesus had said nothing or even been absent. Jesus seems to have thought his intervention cured a veritable case, and thereby acquired faith and courage to try to heal other cases. But the only real cure would have been the prevention of other attacks of the same type, and whether this occurred we are not told. Hence it is all very unsatisfactory. When we remember that the insane were not sequestered in those days, the incident was natural, and the form as it is narrated is quite consonant with what we know both of the prevalent ideas of madness as possession and of the course of Jacksonian epilepsy, which begins in the higher and proceeds downward to lower level centres. It is evident that Mark and Luke thought this cure a miraculous one, but accepting all they say there is no indication that any cure occurred.

The Demoniac.—The healing of the demoniac in far-off heathen Gadara gives us a lurid glimpse of the demonology of that day, and is wild and weird to a degree that suggests Walpurgis-night or the Witches' Sabbath. It has been called the master- or show-piece of all mind-cure tales. Nevertheless it is recorded in all three of the synoptics and with fewer discrepancies than in some of the other thrice-told tales. On landing upon these unknown shores Jesus was met by a wild man (we will

assume one with Mark and Luke, and not two men as with Matthew) coming out of the tombs, naked and so untamable that he broke all fetters, and even chains, wandering day and night, crying out in the mountainous desert and caves, mutilating himself with stones. Seeing Jesus from afar he ran toward and fell down before him in adoration and shrieked, "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of God, most high? I adjure thee by God not to torment me. Send me not away out of the country." When asked his name, he answered "Legion" (the name of a corps of the army of the hated Romans, numbering from four thousand five hundred to six thousand men besides cavalry), so many devils were in him. Thus Jesus alone now faced the cohorts of hell, which recognized him on the instant and from afar for all that he thought himself to be, and begged abjectly for mercy at his hands. Strong as the demons in him had made this man, he grovelled at Jesus' feet and implored him not to inflict torture or to banish him; and Jesus granted the patient's prayer. On the desolate highlands skirting the lake was a herd of swine which some estimate at not less than two thousand in number, animals abhorred by the Jews and suggestive of all gentile abominations; and so, instead of sending the demons directly to the abyss, Jesus transferred them into the swine, whereupon the latter, as if seized by a sudden and uncontrollable panic, such as more gregarious animals are more prone to, stampeded and tore wildly down the precipitate bank and perished in the sea, beneath which the Hebrew traditions thought lay the way to Sheol or the inferno. By this therapeutic prodigy the possessed man was cured, clothed himself, and desired to follow Jesus, but was told instead to proclaim his cure to the people of his own race who had known him. The swine-herds had spread the news of what was done and how, and the people gathered among them, probably the owners of the swine, which Woolston estimates worth at least four thousand dollars. But so alarmed were all that, instead of demanding recompense they besought Jesus to depart, and he did so.

Mitigators of the miraculous have outdone themselves in suggesting modifications of the record as it stands. We have been told that the swine were semiferal and were probably frightened by the cries and gestures of the lunatic, and that the latter was shocked into sanity by realizing the calamity that he had caused. Others have puzzled to make the number of devils in the patient equal to the number of swine.

Others have thought the souls of Jesus' companions, tense in this new unknown country of ill repute, probably interpreted the incoherent and perhaps inarticulate cries of a madman as the acknowledgment of Jesus' divinity, or that the presence of these strangers brought on an epileptic fit which caused the man to fall with a cry and to recover normally. Some said that had it ever entered into the heart of Jesus while living to suspect such an interpretation as the synoptists here made of some natural event, he would have protested and despaired of them. Our narrative as it stands is perhaps an interesting illustration of the way in which excited minds saturated with the folklore of that day might react to a series of perfectly natural, if to them unusual, events. Pierquin in "Traité de folie des animaux," and many others since have shown how liable half-wild flocks of various animals are to sudden alarms. Others, accepting this weird welter of wonders, so strangely felted together, at its face value, praise Jesus' *noblesse oblige* by which he seemed in a truly gentlemanly way to grant the wish of the troop of demons, and then after strategically impounding them in these porcine bodies, stampeding them back to the Hades whence they came. It was thus in miracle plays that God, Christ, angels, and even saints always outwitted the devil and all his imps. Lange and Krabbe think that in this *coup* Jesus did have the aid of angels who influence certain animals, and add that here Jesus penetrated farthest into heathendom and overcame a whole pantheon of demons preparatory to assailing Satan in his own stronghold later. Neander thinks that if Jesus ventured among the rude Gadarenes this narrative was coloured to cover a report from it after some unknown bucolic or pastoral incident, or else that he unwittingly destroyed property and was forced to retire, or that the story as we have it may be a satire made by the owners of the swine to retaliate by sarcasm for their loss. Keim says it should teach moderation to those who are shocked at any scruple about any miracle, and that it should be a kind of *memento mori* against extreme credulity, for it cannot possibly be accepted by a sound mind, at least without involving a belief in demonology far cruder than any form of modern spiritism. The superstitious believer must hold that demons can indwell in animals as well as in man, and that these fool demons destroyed the very bodies that they had just prayed to enter, and went straight to the place from which they had wished to be saved. It seems to involve a belief in malign disembodied spirits

that may wander in waste places, and in psychic personalities that can be transferred, as ancient savage diseases could be conjured, from human to animal or even inanimate bodies. Souls must be interchangeable, therefore, to a high degree. These old soul extractors and exchangers were wont to convince their patients and bystanders that the principle extracted had really left them and gone into something else by making it seem to spill water, upset furniture, shake a tree or flower, make an animal cry out, as a sign that the evicted soul had entered it and left its former host. Thus it is said that we have only to invert the order of events to see that the panic of the swine gave Jesus an opportunity which he used by a flash of inspiration to convince his patient that the devils had really left him, and that the epileptic accepted the suggestion. It was a clever and impromptu therapeutic device which proved to have the pragmatic sanction of working well. To accept this view we need only to change the order of two events, and this we may do on the doctrine of the "timelessness of supernatural events" or by assuming that the inspiration of the Holy Ghost in the writers was so plenary and coercive that they lost all sense of time and sequence, being swallowed up in Bergson's *durée réelle*, the modern euphemism for the old theological eternity, and so became mere "human pens" writing automatically as autistic or planchette writers do now without knowing what they say.

Allegorization.—The allegorists have not been very successful with the Gadara incident. The theory that the demons are heathen gods, who are here expelled by being allowed to follow their own elective affinity and thus reveal their true character, by going to the most unclean of all beasts, is one favourite interpretation of this kind. The rejection of the cured patient who desired to enter the circle of Jesus, and the demand to state and proclaim his cure among his own people, prefigures the establishment of an apostolate among the heathen races. The chains he broke were those of Hebrew legation, custom, form. His pre-prompt recognition of Jesus as the Son of God foreshadows the fact that gentiles led in the acceptance and promulgation of Christianity. We have here, too, the most striking of all conversions from the complete dominion under Satan's kingdom to the Kingdom of God, compared to which that of Paul himself was less sudden or transforming. Thus, too, all swine who cannot appreciate Gospel pearls, and would rend those who present them, are to be offered up as a hecatomb to Satan. Thus this first

promulgation of Jesus to the gentile world is marked by a terrific slaughter of the agents of uncleanness.

John says nothing of casting out devils, as if this odious superstition were already on the wane; and this is one argument to show that John wrote late. Such events, too, do not comport with the *logos* nature of Jesus as held by John. Still, exorcism had become so common in the second century that it was of no value as a proof of supernatural power in those who practised it. Paul does not enumerate this power among the gifts of the Spirit, and in the Johannin circle this practice had probably fallen into ill repute. Strauss even sees here the beginning of a healthful skepticism directed toward the grosser forms of miracle working, and infers that this kind of higher criticism had begun before the completion of our New Testament canon.

Leprosy.—This disease was so malignant and incurable, and also so dreadful from the seclusion that became necessary to prevent infection, that it was commonly thought to be a specific divine punishment. A leper colony even to-day is too horrible for uncensored description. The disease was perhaps more common than we know in ancient Israel. It appeared in Job, and Moses was taught both to cause and to cure it in his own land, to accredit himself with the people as if by a kind of trick in collusion with Yahveh. His sister Miriam was smitten with it as a punishment for her contumacy. Elisha cured the Syrian captain Naaman by prescribing seven immersions in the Jordan. It seems generally to have been placed under a hygienic ban as especially unclean.

One of the earliest miracles ascribed to Jesus and thrice told is the miracle of healing a leper who came, knelt, besought, and expressed faith. Jesus had compassion, touched him, and commanded him to be clean, and he was so. He was then charged to tell no one, but to go to the priests, as the hygienic laws required, and have his cure certified and promulgated so that the restrictions upon his life could be removed. Whether he did so and was duly inspected we are not told, but he violated the behest of silence, and blazoned his cure abroad to such an extent that Jesus had to withdraw to the desert to pray.

This cure staggers faith. Of course the correctness of the diagnosis has often been called in question. Some opined that a sudden upgush of faith in the patient made him feel cured, so that he fancied he detected in himself signs of sudden convalescence, although official

attestation that his condition was improved is lacking. Perhaps, although this is not mentioned, he bathed like Naaman, and was and appeared cleaner. Others think Jesus and his disciples were so sure he could heal that they assumed without scrutiny that the cure had actually occurred, when in fact it had taken place only in their imaginations. Others have suggested a case of what is now known as anaesthetic or nervous leprosy with its alternating train of symptoms.

Luke (only) tells the story of ten lepers just outside a village, who stood at the distance prescribed by law and cried out for mercy. Without touching, Jesus commanded them to go and show themselves to the priests, and on the way they were cleansed of this disease. A few critics have thought this a variation of the former case despite the fact that here ten instead of one are cured, but the sequel gives it an individual character, for nine who were cleansed proceeded on their way, while only one, a Samaritan, returned and effusively thanked his curer. Remarking unfavourably upon the nine who had not glorified God, Jesus dismissed the grateful one, declaring that faith had made him whole. Thus Naaman, also a stranger, had been cured. Jesus said that in Elisha's day there were many lepers in Israel, but only this one had been cured. This instance has to many suggested the parable of the good Samaritan stranger who was the only one of three to be a "neighbour" to the man who fell among thieves. To credit the complete, literal, instant, and wholesale cure of this dread disease is impossible save for those whose minds are leprous with ignorance and superstition. Perhaps one of its lessons is that if such are cleansed it is their duty without ostentatious proclamation to show themselves to their spiritual advisers, who should then publicly proclaim them clean.

Leprosy was thought to be a filth disease, and was common from the earliest times not only in Egypt but in India, China, and most parts of Asia. So it was the fittest of all symbols of the corruption of sin which could be washed away by the cleansing water of baptism. Some think it especially typifies secret personal vice. Its slow but sure progress, and its repulsiveness which makes it a body of living death, best showed what Yahveh thought of iniquity. John, instead of giving us the last and greatest wonder as he does in other series, says nothing of cures from this disease, some think because he was preoccupied in his Semitic way with what Plato called the beautiful and good, and

was averse to facing the harmatological aspects of life in their ugliness and deformity. The synoptic stories are the merest sketches, vulnerable on every side to criticism, so that there was abundant room for a characteristically Johannin culminating cure. But John seems to have felt the leprous nature of sin far less than Paul; for the former seems to have been born good and to have had less knowledge of sin in his own experience, approaching, as is often remarked, the impeccability of Jesus himself. He had rare power of intuition, while Paul became good by a great conversion and laboriously reasoned out his insights. Modern medicine would probably select another disease as best illustrating the effects of individual and hereditary sin, and several such have been suggested, but even yet leprosy has more currency and popular efficacy. The idea of those exegetes was that Jesus was himself an antitoxin or specific against, or panacea to cure, all illnesses, inaugurating a new psychic life so intense that it sloughed off all infirmities, even the most deep-seated and offensive. Had man been sinless he would never have been ill, we are told, and we never hear of sickness among his followers, as if they were immunized by his faith. The cases of leprosy originated in sin and have established the usage of the most expressive of all the metaphors of sin, under the curse of which the unregenerate world is a leper colony to which Christianity comes with a miraculous sudden and complete specific which not merely checks the progress of the disease but restores the degeneration of tissue that it has caused. Thus we are here in the field of rhetoric or heuristics in the large Aristotelian sense, rather than in the domain of historical fact.

Malchus's Ear.—Luke only tells of the *healing of Malchus*, the servant of the high priest whose right ear was "cut off" when Jesus was arrested. He tells us that he "touched his ear and healed him." We are not told whether the entire external ear or a portion of it was smitten off, nor do we know whether we are to infer that Jesus merely staunched the blood or replaced a severed member which grew back by intussusception, or caused a new ear to grow. The incident is not mentioned elsewhere. It shows how ready Luke was to draw on the faith and credulity of his readers without detail or circumstance, and also has a certain significance as an index of his own state of mind. That Jesus paused to remedy this injury at a critical moment in his career seems at the same time a rebuke to Peter, who, we are elsewhere told,

inflicted the blow and whom he also verbally reprimanded. It may have been an act of sympathy evoked by the mutilation, or done by way of placation to avoid precipitating a more serious conflict between his followers and those who came to take him into custody. But the casual way in which the incident is tossed off suggests a power of faith on Luke's part that was capable of believing that on some more serious occasion Jesus would not have been unable to restore Malchus's head had it been severed and had restoration been necessary for his purposes. It was a wild, somewhat comical, and half cowardly act on Peter's part, and a really and wisely valorous man would have attacked not a servant but the leader of the troop, or especially Iscariot himself, against whom vindictive retaliation might have been more fitly directed. It is a strange anticlimax, too, that this should have been represented as the last of all Jesus' miracles. This is the only cure of trauma, and while it might conceivably be invested with symbolic significance, there is no indication that it ever had the slightest.

(B) *Resurrections.*—(a) The raising of the twelve-year-old daughter of the archon Jairus is attested by the three synoptists. As she lay at the point of death the father came and requested healing, but on returning to the house they were told she was dead. Jesus insisted that she was not dead but sleeping, and with three disciples and perhaps the parents went in where she lay, took her by the hand, and called upon her to arise. This she straightway did and walked, when Jesus commanded that food be given her, and charged secrecy which was, of course, impossible. The funeral piping suggests that the friends believed her dead. Only children such as she are often feeble, and her age, to say nothing of the woman healed on the way of the twelve years' issue of blood, suggests first menstruation. Modern literature abounds with death-like trances and swoons at this epoch. One need not be credulous toward modern mind-cures in order to see that this narrative might be a veracious account of a rare but by no means supernatural event. It seems, however, to be attracted into a striking parallelism with the story of Elijah raising the son of the widow of Sarepta. In the one case it is a son, in the other a daughter; here the father, there the mother intercedes; in the one case a staff is laid upon the body, and in the other, hands. In both cases the saver came from a journey and strangers are excluded. The prophet laboured longer, and the resuscitation he effected was more gradual, for we are told that the lad first

sneezed and then opened his eyes. Both are only children, and the parents of both come with faith.[1] By these parallelisms Jesus is made to legitimate himself as a prophet and challenge comparison with the greatest one of old.

Luke alone reports the *resurrection of the youth of Nain.* Here the body was met on the way to burial, which among the Jews was very soon after life went out. This account is but little amplified. Jesus touched the bier, called the young man to arise, which he did and began to speak. As the narrative stands, death in this case is more probable although revival from a swoon is not entirely excluded. The stages of restoration were passed immediately. But why was such an event unknown or unmentioned by the other Evangelists? Here, too, is an Old Testament parallel. The widow's son dies in the presence of Elijah, who carries him to an upper room, stretches himself upon the body, and prays that the youth's soul may return. This famous ancient miracle was performed only half a league from Nain, and the geographical and circumstantial nearness is at least suggestive. The Jewish belief that the soul hovered about the body for some time, and the absence of tests of the complete extinction of life, should also be given due weight. The balance of probabilities in every mind that is at once candid and intelligent cannot long remain in doubt, without invoking the cheap assumption of Paulus, that in this case and that of Jairus's daughter Jesus by his medical experience was able to perceive signs of life unnoticed by others. The candid psychologist cannot fail to admit that we do not yet know very definitely how far the gradual processes of natural death may go and yet be reversed by the intense faith and love of a circle of friends using extreme methods of recall. Very many well-attested cases might be cited of suspended animation and of those who have lived after being snatched from the jaws of death. Allowing only human fallibility of judgment on the part of both bystanders and writers, the still-unexplored limits of nature may not have been transcended in either of the above cases. Jesus may have acquired exceptional insight into the stages by which life passes over into death, and in certain cases he may have achieved resuscitation at a degree of ex-animation still unreached by our methods. At any rate, the tendencies of modern psychological progress suggest some impending advance in both knowledge and practice in this

[1] Keim, "History of Jesus of Nazara." Vol 4, p. 173.

direction, and medical science may by natural means ere long accomplish somewhat more than is even yet generally thought possible.

In these two cases of resuscitation of adolescents it may seem at first sight symbolism run wild to suggest an allusion to the well-understood fact that this age is itself one of regeneration, the salient traits of which are the outburst of physical growth, the beginning of love, by which life normally passes over from egoism to altruism, the awakening of the intellect, the new orientation to adulthood, and the fact that this everywhere is the age of conversion, confirmation, or initiation into the tribe, and also the period of new liabilities to arrest or retardation of the subsequent stages of development, which are so precious yet so precarious.[1] The *tout ensemble* of these changes, the new temptations and the new dangers, and the successful overcoming of them all might well be typified here; but this would be too cryptic and recondite. The discrepancies in the first narrative are so great that some think there were two girls healed at different times. Again, all three accovnts strangely insert very near the middle of the narrative, as Jesus was on the way to heal the twelve-year-old girl, the case of the woman with the twelve-year issue of blood. The placing of this latter event on the way to the bedside of the dead or dying girl is hardly sufficient excuse for injecting it into the narrative in the way in which all the synoptists do it. Indeed, the question is inevitable whether the association of death or the death-like swoon at the age of first menstruation showing phenomena that suggest aborted molimena, with a case of menorrhagia or excess, does not imply a more inner relation between the two. It at least suggests the question whether the first cure may have consisted in the inauguration of the first monthly period. If so, we have a veiled intimation that here Jesus is made to control the lunar phenomena of womankind and thus to appear in a new way as Lord of the very gates of life. As Yahveh of old made wombs barren or fertile, so here Jesus stands forth as the normalizer of the function by which was fulfilled the old covenant with Abraham, whereby if he kept the Lord's law and word his seed should be multiplied like the uncounted stars. On this eugenic view Jesus is made Lord of the unborn as well as of children and youth. He controls the entrance to as well as the exit from life. In this so evidently belaboured and disparately told story, and the baffling and unparalleled incorporation of a

[1] See my "Adolescence." New York, 1904, 2 vols.

healing into the midst of a resurrection story, we may thus have before us an attempt to establish Jesus as the controller of excessive or defective functioning of sex in women. The feeling that virtue had gone out of him in staunching the bloody flux has often been called suggestive, but no commentator that I can find has ever attempted to tell of what. It probably refers to the mysterious healing power that emanated from Jesus' body working independently of his will, and perhaps coming directly from the Father. Few, if any, miracles make so strong an impression that there is behind something untold and utterly inaccessible, however much it may challenge conjecture. The writers seem desirous of expressing something which they could not express, either from lack of insight into a tradition which had already taken a certain form and to which they felt loyal and could not omit, or else because they saw in it some meaning that needed to be veiled for a larger and less esoteric public, on a tabooed topic on which they were liable to speak too plainly. So they adopted this method of inserting one account into another, hoping that to the wise, at least, the hidden meanings would seep through while they imposed upon themselves a strict censorship. A large body of new knowledge to-day shows the reciprocal control each by the other of all psychoneural phenomena and the *vita sexualis*. The son of the widow of Nain was also an only child, like the daughter of Jairus. Thus Luke's mother-son narrative exactly complements that of the father-daughter pair in the synoptists. The latter, too, is dead by added tokens; which suggests either subsequent accommodation or else that there was a number of such cases from the abundance of which the writer could select one that was extraordinarily fitted for this purpose.

(b) *The raising of Lazarus* (John only) is as it stands the most stupendous and confounding of all miracles, more so in some respects than even the Resurrection of Jesus himself; for in the latter case there was no putrefaction, and there were also no witnesses and no details of just how it occurred. Sincerely as Jesus loved Lazarus and his sisters, when the latter sent him word of their brother's illness, he quietly remained where he was two days, with no intimation of any special duties, but remarked to those about him that the sickness was not unto death, although the sequel shows that it was, and although he later told his disciples that Lazarus was not asleep but really dead. Only when Thomas, overwhelmed with pathos, exhorted the disciples

to go to Bethany and die with the friend they all seemed to love so ardently, did Jesus consent to start for the afflicted home. Why did the Johannin or Logos-Christ delay? He explained this later by saying that he was glad he was not present at the death, in order that they might have occasion to believe that it had all occurred for the glory of God and his Son. The object of the delay thus seems to have been to give an object-lesson of God's power to raise the dead. The soul was supposed in that day to leave a corpse on the end of the third day, and then the body was given over to corruption. So Jesus waited four days, until as Martha said the body stank, a delay that from the human standpoint seemed inhuman, all the more so if Jesus had the slightest doubt of his success in raising him from the dead, although the implication is obvious that his confidence in his power to do this was absolute. The mourning friends were thus compelled to endure their grief for the sake of the great demonstration that was to follow. On the other hand, Jesus did not at first expect a fatal issue of the illness, although he knew later, apparently telepathically, that Lazarus was dead, and then was intent upon showing that what seemed so conclusively to mortals to be death was really only sleep, from which he knew how to awaken those he loved. Thus, while he lingered in Perea his higher nature knew all the while what was to occur, and he stayed just long enough to make the miracle most impressive and dramatically effective. The sisters upbraided Jesus for his delay, saying that had he been there their brother would not have died. They seem to have had no intimation that his assertion that their brother would be awakened could mean anything but at the resurrection of the last day. When Jesus told Martha that he was the resurrection and the life, and whoever believed in him, though he were dead, would live, and added that whosoever believed on him would never die, she does not seem to have drawn the inference that because truly dead her brother had not believed. When asked if she accepted all this, her hope seems to have been revived but to be yet held in abeyance, so that she only answered that she believed he was Christ, the Son of God, and then hastened off to call her sister Mary to be present, as if to witness some great impending event which at least might be possible. When Mary came with a large group of sympathizing Jews, like a Greek chorus or like the mourners and musicians when Jairus's daughter was raised, unlike the synoptic Jesus, who is sympathetic with grief, the Logos-Christ seems vexed that

any one should weep while he, the very principle of life, is present, and also because he had been reproached for not being present and thus permitting the death. But if he felt anger it turned at once to grief, and we are told that he wept as he is never said elsewhere to have done, save in view of Jerusalem when bemoaning the troubles that awaited her.

The sepulchre before which all now stood was very like that of Jesus later, hewn out of a rock and closed with a stone, while the grave-clothes also were similar, prefiguring thus Jesus' own Resurrection. At his command the stone was removed despite Martha's protest that after four days the corpse would be offensive. Then Jesus prayed, thanking God that he was heard as always, not asking power to do this miracle, but as if feeling that he already had virtually done it, and apologizing to Yahveh for praying at all, on the ground that he did so that bystanders might know that he was the Son of God, and perhaps to lift their thoughts to him. Critics have impugned the motivation of this prayer as mockery, as acting, or at least as accommodation. The synoptic Christ might pray for power as Elijah had done before restoring the dead, but the Johannin Christ is above the need of asking or thanking, because his whole life is an effusion of God. The prayer is thus pedagogical, to show his oneness with the Father. As Hilgenfeld well said, we have in this record traces of the dualization or incomplete fusion of the divine and human nature. After this Jesus "cried with a loud voice, 'Lazarus, come forth.' And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes; and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, 'Loose him and let him go.' " With this dumbfounding *dénouement* the narrative stops short.

The natural curiosity to know Lazarus' state of mind and his subsequent experiences after his reanimation, whether all traces of the disease that caused his death had been eliminated, whether he was restored at once to his maximum of health and strength, and how much truth there is in the persistent tradition that the family suffered at the hands of the Pharisees—all this is not gratified, although literature has repeatedly sought to fill the void in our knowledge by fantasy. It used to be said that Lazarus had not confessed Christ, and so his soul had to be called back not from paradise but from Hades, and that thus he had the only opportunity vouchsafed to any mortal to accept Christ after some experience with post-mortem existence. If this is

so, it is regrettable that we are not told explicitly whether he really was saved at last.

This is, of course, the miracle of miracles and the most staggering of all to faith, even to that of orthodoxy. The first question which naturally arises is why the other three Evangelists say and apparently know nothing of it. They wrote earlier, and there was every reason why they should have chronicled it and none why they should not; and those reasons that have been brought forward why they should not are of little or no weight. It has been conjectured, e. g., that owing to this incident persecution had caused Lazarus' family and friends to move to parts unknown, and that this miracle had dropped out of the memory of the circle in which the synoptists moved till John unearthed it. But surely it was unique and too famous not to have been heard of by all Jesus' followers. Others have said that the synoptists were not apostles, and that this was reserved to John who was. But there were no other reservations; on the contrary, what was known of Jesus seems to have been used by each writer with no restrictions save those he imposed upon himself. Some agreement has been fancied among the apostles by which this fell to John, but the other dozen miracles which two or more of the Gospels have in common make this improbable. Some have had recourse to the view that it was not really Lazarus' body but his ghost in ghostly grave-clothes that appeared. But this would severely tax the credulity of all who doubt the existence of ghosts, and it distinctly contravenes the spirit of the narrative. The much-overworked hypothesis of suspended animation has been adduced despite its exclusion by the statement that putrefaction had begun. Some have conjectured that the first Gospels did not mention this incident because it might injure the feelings, or imperil even the safety, of Mary and Martha, and interfere with their effort to escape the notoriety it had brought to the family while they were at Bethany; or again it has been urged that the first synoptists desired to magnify the Galilean career of Jesus, and were jealous of deeds done, as this was, in Judea. In the more liberal camp, too, we find a great variety of theories. Renan, e. g., conjectures that Lazarus had been ill, but was better. His sisters, who were intensely sympathetic with Jesus, knew that the latter was near the most depressing period of his career, since his rôle of Messiah was making increasing claims upon him which he was more and more unable to meet, until the distress

from this cause finally drove him to accept death as a welcome relief, because the part of Messiah had become intolerable. Fearing some tragic result from this extreme depression in which Jesus now was, these well-meaning sisters hit upon a ruse in fulfilment of which Lazarus, now recovered but still pale and weak from his illness, allowed himself just before Jesus' arrival to be wrapped in a winding sheet and shut up in the family tomb, to which Martha conducted Jesus immediately upon his arrival because he desired to see him. She, who represents the Petrine executive as her sister Mary does the Johannin contemplative type, had gathered a crowd, and Jesus then called upon Lazarus, upon which he came forth. Thus not only the people, but very probably Jesus, thought this was a miracle, and Jesus, if he suspected any deception about it, did not betray his friends, either because he was so sad and weary that he had grown a little indifferent for the moment, or because he may have sought to console himself with the forlorn hope that possibly he had raised the dead without intending to do so. Others, also, such as Saints Bernard and Francis d'Assisi, were unable to check the passion for miracles among their friends, and so they were almost coerced into the rôle of miracle-workers, perhaps despite ineffective protests. This view of course compels us to sacrifice either the truth of John's account or else the sagacity and common sense, if not the honour, of Jesus.

Many exegetes think to mitigate some one or other single feature of the record, making concessions of detail to save the rest; and others, assuming some unknown incident as a nucleus, admit some degree of distortion or exaggeration. Protestants have from Luther down found this the most troublesome of all things in the story of Jesus' life, unconsciously assuming, perhaps, that, as Spinoza said in substance of himself, if they once accepted this marvel literally they would be compelled to accept Jesus as superman, even if they knew nothing else about him. Every other claim of Christianity would be easy if this were once accepted. Some have advised that here reason be held in abeyance to a *credo quia absurdum* or abandonment to faith, and would make this the cardinal shibboleth or orthodoxy. In this they are right, for a credulity that can accept this will stick at nothing.

The rationalistic school reminds us that the only evidence that decomposition had set in was Martha's opinion, and that she was probably mistaken. Paulus thought that Lazarus was in a comatose state,

or lethargy, from which he was awakened by the opening of the tomb, which let in light and warm air, and calls attention to the fact that Jesus merely commanded him to come forth and not to awake from the dead. It has also been suggested that Jesus' keen sight perceived slight movements in the corpse that others did not notice. Gabler, assuming Lazarus had really died, says Jesus had very good reason for saying he was glad he was not present, because if he allowed any one, especially a friend of his, to die in his presence, he would lose Messianic prestige. If we were to grant either of the above suppositions, Jesus is made an actor, and his moral character is sacrificed. The excision of difficult passages as interpolations has also been attempted by various critics, notably Deffenbach. Luke conjectures that Jesus' delays were excused by the fact that he was having a great revivalistic success in his ministry in Perea and therefore, especially as he was instinctively averse to miracle-working, felt himself bound to remain where he was. Jesus was also predominantly a teacher in that he deliberately proposed to let Lazarus die and then resuscitate him rather than to heal him before his death, because this would have a better pedagogic object-lesson effect on Lazarus' friends and others, although in no other case does he try to increase his miracles.

But surely the time has long since come when it can and must be said that belief in this miracle taken literally is a psychological impossibility for any intelligent modern soul. This is a case where the will to believe cannot compel belief itself. The Kalif Omar, the dearest friend of the great prophet of Mohammedanism, after he had just seen his master die, stepped to the door of the tent with drawn sword, affirming that the prophet still lived and threatening death to any one who dared to deny it, because he felt the pragmatic sanction that it was expedient for the people to think him yet alive. Thus Jove was said to have recourse to his thunderbolts when he knew he was in the wrong. Thus too, psychoanalysis explains how men can vociferate most those things they wish to make themselves believe but cannot, and may even persecute those who confess the doubts which they themselves more or less unconsciously feel. Thus one active and vital Church to-day sends out as missionaries those young men who have just begun to doubt its creed, and finds that by a few years of trying to convince others they have stifled their own doubts. Thus, and in many other ways, reason may be silenced and depressed where it can-

not be immolated. To avow faith in such a miracle as this is a confession of ignorance of what true sincerity and conviction are.

Not only has this narrative become an offense to the modern Christian consciousness which causes rejection of the whole Christian scheme by ingenuous youth who have been taught that it is integral and that all the rest falls if this does, but returns which we have collected from many orthodox Christians show that this miracle has either quietly lapsed into insignificance and has come to be ignored as if it were encapsulated like a foreign body in the soul, or else it lies heavily on the conscience as a positive handicap to both faith and works. Assemblages of Protestant clergymen confess that they rarely preach about it, save incidentally as a symbol, and Schleiermacher said it was really of little significance, even for spiritual edification. Those who think they believe it, or try to, do so with reservations of which they may not be aware. The very soreness and touchiness of orthodoxy concerning it, and its readiness to turn loose the awful *odium theologicum* upon those who openly question it, is of itself a conclusive proof of the official and precarious tenure with which it is still clung to in the ultra-conservative camp. This state of mind is not unlike that of neurotics. A young woman, e. g., worn out by the petulance of an incurably morbid mother, half realized one day that she perhaps really wished her parent were dead. She was so horrified by the recognition of this motive submerged in herself that it led her to redouble all her careful assiduities and protestations of love for her mother, while she became morbidly timid lest others should suspect her awful death-thought, which she was trying to strangle down by over-compensation. An upright man was surprised by a temptation which in an unguarded and relaxed moment suddenly sprang upon and nearly overcame him, and thereafter he made himself a paragon of the countervailing virtues. Kant's theory that belief in God, soul, and immortality work well, and although unprovable to the pure theoretical are true to the practical reason, led to modern pragmatism that makes the effects on conduct the criterion of truth, as James, Schiller, and better yet, Vaihinger (in his "Philosophie des Als Ob") have explained in great detail. But even granting that faith in Lazarus' miracle worked pedagogically well in the early stages of Christianity, by this very test to-day this miracle must be utterly discredited. It has become a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense and should be sloughed off as a *caput mortuum*

or death's head at every symposium of Christian experience. Nor is it enough to allow it to lapse into innocuous desuetude. As every enlightened man has seen who has had any experience in meeting the doubts of earnest, honest, truth-seeking young men over this, once this handicap is dispelled there is a regeneration of loyalty to Jesus' person and a reinforced zest to penetrate to the inner meaning of his positive teaching to our age; but mere negations like the above will not suffice to accomplish this emancipation. We must understand the motivation of the fabrication, and at least indicate, though we cannot here do so in great detail, why it has come to occupy its present though false position in the conservative Christian consciousness. This may be roughly stated as follows, premising only that in doing so we enter a field of both individual and folk-psychology that is still more or less strange, if not yet finally explored by expert students.

The first and strongest impression which Jesus left on his followers after his departure from the world consisted in their conviction that he had arisen from the dead and thereby conquered the king of terrors. For the early Christians, fear of death was changed into exaltation, if not often into longing. His Resurrection was Paul's cardinal theme, without which he said all faith was vain. Inebriation with this conviction and all it implied was the chief cause of the ecstatic phenomena of Pentecost when the Holy Spirit was given, the chief mission of which was to give faith in the Resurrection. The great death-killer had brought life and immortality to light, and it was because he had arisen that all the lingering doubts of the disciples as to his nature and mission were finally dispelled. Belief in the Resurrection was the chief test in the acceptance of new converts. Jesus' teachings as well as all the incidents of his life paled relatively to this submission to and subsequent conquest of death. This tremendous transforming conviction in both its form and degree was a new thing in the world, and for decades and even generations, it brought into and kept the early promulgators and their converts in a state somewhat predisposed to ecstasy. This was augmented by the tribulations and persecutions to which the early Church was subjected. What was more natural, therefore, than that the immediate successors of Jesus should develop apperception centres keenly attuned to everything in Jesus' life and work that pertained to his death-quelling function and power? This, too, was the chief focus of doubt, and by far the most vulnerable point

of attack by those who rejected or questioned the message of the Gospel. There was in believers a strong determining tendency to lay stress on all that made for and to ignore all that made against this prime article of faith, and to require a *Stellungsnahme* to it from all proselytes. Even the synoptic Gospels did not escape this tendency to stress and exaggerate the details of the two resurrections which they ascribe to Jesus; but in the considerable interval between their composition and that of the Fourth Gospel the need of and the wish for stronger attestation grew apace. John and his circle would inevitably have felt this most, and that for two reasons: first, John was the only apostle to whom a Gospel is ascribed; and second, he was the beloved disciple who stood closest to Jesus and from whom most would be expected, while he and his disciples would also most desire to help out the nascent Church at this its weakest point.

(c) *Jesus' Own Resurrection.*—The accepted miracles of Jesus readily fall into two classes, the least, like those of healing slight ailments, on to the cures of chronic and constitutional disorders, and thus up the ladder to the two earlier resurrections, which the synoptists report that Jesus effected, viz., that of Jairus's daughter and the young man. Neither of these two cases of resurrection was unimpeachable by carpers. From them to Jesus' own Resurrection was a very long step, not only in time (for the above two resurrection miracles came relatively early in Jesus' ministry), but in convincing power and in fulness of attestation. Here, then, was a chasm, a veritable missing link which, if it could be supplied, would make the series complete and rather uniformly graded, so as to show a progressive succession of tolerably equal steps in the development of Jesus' power and also in the development of the power of faith in his followers. Then Jesus would stand forth in a new light as being able and willing to vitalize with new life all who needed it, all the way from those transiently indisposed, in whom the energy of the great biologos was temporarily abated, on to those in whom it was entirely extinct. Here, then, was a void that could only be filled by a miracle of recuperation more marked and more circumstantially attested than anything in the three then-existing Gospels or in the Old Testament. There must be no room for any doubt that the death was itself real. It must be of some definite and more or less known person (although he must not be too well known; John the Baptist, e. g., much as the disciples might have wished Jesus to raise him, would not do, because

all persons raised from the dead have to vanish so that we have no subsequent knowledge of their lives), and there must also be witnesses, both friendly and hostile. The tomb must have been closed securely, just as that of Jesus had been, but the stone must be removed and the corpse go forth in broad daylight, in sight of all, and with the winding-sheet still about him. These were items the lack of which in the already more or less fixed traditions of Jesus' own Resurrection had been found painfully lacking in effectiveness, and the new miracle must supply these defects. Moreover, the needed miracle must be placed at what has often been called the dark hour of Jesus' ministry, when he was most depressed and felt most keenly the meshes of destiny closing about him. This period of his ministry, too, was relatively miracleless and somewhat uneventful, Jesus' great deeds and great doctrines having been already promulgated, while the closing scenes of his life were not yet begun. There was a rather waste place that needed a great event to give better proportion and more orderly progression to the processional of his story on earth. Here, too, the fame of such an event was necessary to explain the otherwise not fully motivated acclaim that the synoptics had said Jesus was met with on entering Jersusalem. Finally, it would help also to explain and intensify the rancour and jealousy of the envious scribes and Pharisees in Jerusalem. Therefore the miracle should be placed near and not long before Jesus' entry into this city. Thus the psychological hour, place, and act were predetermined. Something adapted to meet all these specifications ought by every token to occur; and, therefore, if it was believed, it would be truer than historic fact because it would have the supreme pragmatic sanction of faith that is above sight.

This miracle, as we read it, was therefore no individual fabrication, like Plato's myths, but something that inevitably would gradually develop in the fructifying psychic soil of the Johannin group. The soul-stuff of which it was wholly made was not fantasy alone, but had a very large ingredient of practical will as well. It was long especially dear to faith because made warp and woof of faith. To us to-day it is only a rare and fascinating fossil from a past age of an extinct species, which tells us only what religious culture history used to be. Its rejection to-day is not because our faith is less, but because faith now needs new and higher forms, and, like the chambered nautilus, the Christian soul must build for itself ever larger mansions.

In the early Christian centuries it became very much the fashion to develop miracles for edification purposes, as is copiously illustrated all the way from the apocryphal Gospels to the "Acta Sanctorum." Pious wishes were given a license in construing nature because the power of the transcendent was prepotent over the material world as never before. The *Jenseits* controlled the *Diesseits* to an unparalleled degree; for this world was nothing, while the new supernal Kingdom of the future was all. Earth was translucent and was thus also transcended. It was very soon to pass away, while the other world was eternal. Hence the cosmos as we know it was only a symbol of the other world, and faith was the new-born organ and sanctioned belief in what man fondly longed to believe, uncensored by criticism. Science was unknown, and its earliest votaries when they arose were thought in league with the devil. The miracle of Lazarus was the most conspicuous and perhaps the first fruit of this type of fabrication. It was the masterpiece of all its kind, and both set the pattern and opened the door of license for hosts of inferior creations evolved for the same purpose, the pious end of which was felt abundantly to justify their construction. This justification was something as follows:

Something like this could happen, or else God's omnipotence was limited. Moreover, Jesus had arisen, and as he raised himself he must be able to raise others; and he had promised to raise all the dead ere long. A paradigm of his power to do this was greatly needed as an ante-past and guarantee of the final resurrection, to demonstrate that he could reverse the normal processes of decay. An ocular demonstration of the possibility of the future resurrection of all men was necessary, or else it might be and was said that "he raised himself, others he could not raise." A great companion-piece to his own self-resuscitation was needed wherein he revived a common, average man. It was meet to show that the Father could raise others just as truly as he had raised his only begotten Son. Hence, both the similarities and the contrast between these two events were especially wrought out. Like Lazarus, all men would soon be raised, and the good would follow Christ to heaven.

It was also so certain that Jesus could have done it, and it was so urgent that he should have done it, that what ought to be must be more truly than what really is. He could not possibly have left his earthly work with so obvious a lacuna, and therefore he must have

given a type instance of his power to raise the dead that would be no less convincing in its way than was his own Resurrection. It was a case that the patristic writers described as *fides quaerens objectum*, for faith is the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen. The will to believe must have an object on which to wreak itself, and if it did not find it, had to make one. This would not be so difficult because the three then-existing Gospels were very scrappy and imperfect jottings, and left so much of his life unwritten that all the books in the world, we are told, could not contain it. Hence there was a free field for this non-Bergsonian kind of creative evolution, for the imagination, as Fröscheimer has shown us, is in its inmost essence a totalizing faculty, complementing the imperfections of the individual with the perfections of the whole. This, we are told, is its chief function. Thus we can see that this miracle was no extemporized production, but the unique and classic structure of its type, most of all independent of Old Testament analogies and allusions.

Still, as others have pointed out, its poets or artificers took suggestions from diverse sources. Many have shown, from Strauss to Jülicher, who has devoted his life to the study of the parables, how they sometimes shade over into, overlap, and interpenetrate miracles in a few cases. Thus it has been urged that the Lazarus here was borrowed from the blind beggar of the parable whom Luke represents as sitting covered with sores at Dives's gate, and after death as transferred to Abraham's bosom. Both are sick, both die and are buried. The one did return from the grave, and the other desired to do so, but was not allowed because the brethren he wished to warn would not believe, just as the Jews did not believe the Johannin Lazarus really did return. Thus the thought of reveniance, the name of the hero of it, and that of his sisters, given by Luke, serve perhaps as *points de repère* for the Fourth Evangelist, so that Lazarus was resurrected, in another sense, by being transferred from an allegorical existence in a parable to a flesh-and-blood personality. The rest of the narrative was framed to fit the various exigencies of the situation as we have seen them. Very probably this entire narrative of forty-five verses grew gradually into its final form from many repetitions, interpolations, and excisions, till a slowly evolving consensus made it fit the psychological exigencies to a degree that merely historical happenings rarely, if ever, do.

It should be distinctly understood that the word "fabrication" is taken here in its literal sense of making, as a poet is a maker, and not at all in its derived sense, which implies some degree of falsification. So anchored were these "makers" in truth that they could freely with poetic license "play with gracious lies." Like their master, yet more often, the Johannin group of followers was prone to exaltation, not only owing to their theme and also the tensity of the times, but because in them these tendencies were reinforced by a mildly erethic diathesis of soul which predisposed them to visions and revelations. They were poets under the inspiration of a new muse which they revered under the name of the Holy Ghost. So multifarious were these impulsions that they were exhorted to test all spirits to see if they were good, and to discard others. Thus such a formation as this truly *nascitur non fit*, and it was accepted with an enthusiasm that was psychologically identical, being less only in degree, with that which evolved it. For it must not be forgotten that we are always here in the realm of James's "higher powers of man," where the phenomena are all normal but of unusual altitude, like the exhilaration that both myth and experience ascribe to mountain-tops.

Now precisely this strong fecund tendency to make edification-value the supreme test of truth, a tendency so vital that it persisted long after it had degenerated to fatuousness, was very largely the natural result of Jesus' own chronically transcendent state of mind, and also of his notable pedagogic invention of the parable, which consisted of incidents only spiritually true. Not only to art but to Christian experience the prodigal son is as real as, if not more so than, the Lazarus of the resurrection. The disciples must often have wondered whether Jesus was telling an apt anecdote of some one who really lived and whom he knew, recounting things that actually happened, or hypothecating both persons and events to meet a practical exigency or a didactic end for which only verisimilitude was needed. With Jesus there was no confusing of the parables he told and the miracles he did. The substance of the former is always a natural, if not common, event from daily life, and so the very opposite of a marvel. But if common occurrences could be fabricated for heuristic ends, sooner or later it would inevitably be asked why uncommon events could not be thus used, especially since the latter had now become an integral part of the new order of things and in excited minds prone to supersti-

tion were common enough. Again, Jesus regarded his healings as mainly symbols of healing the soul from the ravages of sin. Thus it was not strange if the real truth of all things came to consist in their higher meanings, and the value of historicity as such inevitably suffered relative decline. The parabling of Jesus thus proved to be the innocent and unsuspected beginning of a new test of objective truth and reality. Hence, in another sense, the story of Lazarus is a precious missing link, for it lies half way between the parabling propensity of the Great Teacher and the miracle-mongering of, e. g., the Bolandist fathers in whom credulity stopped at nothing, however preposterous, if they thought it contained spiritual edification. Absurd to reason and abominable to science as the tale of a reanimated corpse is, it nevertheless glows deep down in the soul below consciousness in all, however rational or scientific, when the lust for personal survival beyond this life is strong. Unconjugated as it is by any mood or tense of the grammar of assent as Newman construed it, under the severest ban of logic, *bewusstseinsunfähig* to the cultured modern mind, outlawed by the higher and often even the lower criticism, surd and anachronism as it now is, nevertheless, when in revery childish wish-dreams recur in those souls in whom the supreme question they put to life is to know whether when a man die he shall live again, this preposterous tale grows warm and phosphoresces deep down in the heart, the oldest part of our psychic organism. Thus, as at last spring reanimates nature; thus, too, as the immortal germ plasm is resurrected out of the moribund soma in each generation by love; so the often idiotic prose of superstition may be rescued to the highest uses by poetic genius. It was reserved to geneticism to teach us that things utterly false on the lowest may be Bible truths in the highest psychic levels.

(C) *Cures at a Distance.*—Of cures at a distance there are several narratives. The centurion was of gentile birth, but a lover of the Jews, and had built them a synagogue. His son was paralyzed, tormented, and, Luke says, about to die. Matthew's less artificial account says the centurion came himself; Luke, that he sent messengers twice. He would invite Jesus, but was unworthy to receive him. He had faith in his power to command spirits, which he thought analogous to his own to command his soldiers. He believed Jesus could heal with a word at a distance. Remarking (in a phrase sometimes challenged

as rupturing the spirit both of the narrative and the general purpose of the Evangelist who records it) that this faith was greater than he had found in Israel, Jesus said that it would be to him according to his belief. John's edition of this miracle is so different that some have thought it another event. It is now the son of a nobleman, perhaps a Jew, at the point of death with a fever. Jesus said, "thy son liveth," and it was later found that he began to mend the same hour. Then the father and his house believed.

With this double narrative we can hardly identify, as some do, the other case of healing at a distance, the daughter of the Greek woman vexed with a devil. She is far more gentile than the centurion, and Jesus was reluctant because he declared that he was sent to save only in Israel, and that the children's bread should not be cast to dogs. But she importuned that dogs might eat the crumbs that fell from the table. Commending her faith, he granted her wish, and her daughter was made whole, for the devil left her. Mark omits the account of the centurion, although its attendant lessons would harmonize with his spirit, but records that of the Greek girl. This is said to indicate identity and to support the hypothesis of the greatest freedom of treatment of the same material. But, on the other hand, Matthew contains both, which shows that he regarded them as two, as, indeed, most have held. Each raises the question of Jesus' service to those who are not Jews, although the centurion may have been a proselyte as well as a benefactor, and this may account for Jesus' friendly spirit toward the one appeal and his reluctance toward the other. The difficulty with John's nobleman is that he travels so slowly a distance of only five leagues homeward to reach his dying son, although this loitering has on the other hand been regarded as an indication of his certainty that the cure had been effected and that his presence at home was not needed. These cures at a distance exclude not only contact but probably faith on the patient's part. Strauss regards the first incident as a fictitious imitation of Elisha's cure of the leper Naaman at a distance, and thinks each may typify and foreshow the penetration of Jesus' influence into far-off gentile lands. Paulus assumes a messenger sent to communicate the cure. If the son and daughter knew their parents' mission, faith and expectation may not have been absent; and some have challenged only the coincidence of the telepathic word and the curing, assuming that the joyful confidence of the parent or messenger

upon his return gave the curative stimulus. Magnetism and a "direct mental path" have also been assumed.

The healing miracles are often graded as, first, those with material means, saliva, clay, washing; second, touching; third, by words alone, when the patient was present; fourth, by a word efficacious at a distance, and, lastly, with no will, intent, or even knowledge on Jesus' part, curative power being, as it were, surreptitiously drawn from him when he had no purpose to heal. It is a moot point whether a cure thus stolen by touching his garment ever became efficacious if he did not know it at once afterward, while some imply that even an accidental contact with his garments unbeknown to him, and also with no intent or knowledge on the patient's part, was really curative.

In these cases, as elsewhere, the discrepancies in the various accounts can best be explained as showing "an increasing materialization of the idea of a miracle," while the above series from the application of remedies to accidental contact and action at a distance show a growing abandon to belief in some magical agency with which Jesus' body was charged, but the loss of which left him depleted for a time of healing virtue, even without knowing whose touch drew upon it. A further growth of the same tendency later made handkerchiefs, aprons, and even the shadow of Peter efficacious, as we find in the Acts, and thence led to the belief in the therapeutic power of tombs like that of the Abbé of Paris, and in relics, and bones provided they were believed to be those of saints; for here faith is essential. To explain Jesus' power to project his will at a distance apologists often remind us of the phenomenal nature of space, which is only for corporeal nature and not for spiritual things. Spiritual powers are not bound down to our common space of three dimensions.

These tendencies show to psychoanalysis a strong but blind impulse in the early Christian consciousness toward sublimation, a tendency, however, mistaken in kind and direction. When the Gospels were composed Jesus had long since ascended and the salvatory power of his personality had to act at a distance or not at all, and so an instance of his telepathy while on earth was sorely needed. If he could heal a few leagues away, he might still exert his healing power from his heavenly home. His person here had been uniquely magnetic, his spirit contagious, his will compelling; and his Resurrection body might be conceived as vastly more so to faith. Every vestige and relic

of him thus become an Archimedean fulcrum of leverage for the faith that could remove mountains of guilt from man's sin-sick soul. Jesus was an embodied panacea for all human ills, sarcous and psychic. He was life and health, which latter word means wholeness or holiness. The Great Physician had been supercharged with therapeutic, orthopaedic, euthenic power, and where he had gone there could be no sickness or sorrow. How could this great inspiring conviction be imparted with the culture resources then at his disciples' disposal? It was too great for any of the devices of rhetoric. No figurative language could compass it. History afforded no adequate precedents, examples, or illustrations of it, and so there was no possible recourse save to couch the message of this new muse in a new language, and thus and for this purpose the healing miracle was created.

In referring to the vindictive miracle of cursing the fig-tree at a distance, Mark makes it cursed one day and withered the next, as one blind man was cured in stages. It is added that the time of fruit was not yet, which was true in Judea the week before Easter. Why, therefore, was it cursed for not bearing fruit out of its season? The only answer is that this tree was a symbol of unfruitful Israel, at the root of which the axe was laid. In the parable of the fig-tree, barren for two years and condemned to be cut down, the gardener pleaded that he be allowed to give it special attention for another season, and if it then remained barren it might be felled without further grace. But there is no respite or parley, but a curse that blights at once. Thus the divine wrath, like love, is telepathic, and thus even from high heaven the wicked may be smitten. Thus Jesus is invested with the power of black, as of white, magic.

(D) *Nature Miracles:* (a) *The Water Made Wine.*—Perhaps the first of all Jesus' miracles, marking his début as a wonder-worker, and certainly the first nature miracle (recorded only by John), was at Cana. Here and at this time in Galilee experts tell us wedding festivities lasted a week. All the guests were exalted, and the wine was exhausted. Jesus' mother called his attention to the fact, as if she expected he could and would relieve the situation. He protested with some apparent resentment, because his hour was not yet come; but acquiesced, though under protest, either as if to humour her, or in response to so open a challenge to help on the revels, and with no modern temperance scruples. By his order six stone jars, holding, according to

research into the antiquities of that age, from one hundred and eight to one hundred and sixty-two gallons, were filled to the brim with water, and it was found, apparently almost on the instant and without word, prayer, sign, or effort on his part, that all this water was transpeciated into wine, and that of the very best quality, suggesting further jollity and inebriation.

It is both pathetic and ludicrous to see how the Christian consciousness has so crassly and persistently attempted to make bread out of this stone of stumbling and offence. If it were a miracle of transpeciation, Jesus was here doing something very akin to what he had a few days before refused to do at Satan's behest. Now he would be doing it only to further luxury and the delectation of a merry marriage party, when he would not do it to save himself from death by thirst and starvation. Regarded as a factual miracle, it is both clumsy and unmotivated, the product of an idle whim or caprice, and as senseless as animating mud birds and making them fly away, as an apocryphal Gospel said Jesus did as a lad.

It would be hard to say whether the orthodox literalists or the early rationalists have been most absurd. Paulus thought it all a sportive wedding jest in which wine was secretly smuggled in by some collusive trick or conjuring. Ammon suggested some unrecorded use of "spirits of wine," and Langerdorf says it was done by some unknown use of "extracts of herbs." Others have thought it might be a case of making bitter water sweet, hard water soft, or impure water pure. A long list of mystic intermediate substances has been proposed, while some have suggested that the miracle consisted in tinging the water with blood, perhaps that of Jesus, as a symbol of his coming death and of its atoning power. The learned, pious, and voluminous expositor and commentator Lange, naïvely intimated that it might have been Seltzer water or a magnetized water, while others have suggested that it was perhaps from an effervescing or mineral spring near by which only Jesus knew, by revelation, or perhaps naturally. Many have had recourse to the very hard-worked hypothesis of accelerated natural processes by which water poured on the roots of vines in the spring would become wine after the grapes were trodden and fermented in vats in the fall; while here the same process in all its stages was rushed through as if time had been dissolved into a Bergsonian eternal duration. Unlike most miracles, this has no analogue in the Old Testament,

and just what event, if any, underlies the narrative we can probably never know.

Somewhat more insightful apologists have taken refuge in the hypothesis of mental exaltation, a state to which the guests toward the end of a hilarious week, where they had exceeded the expectations of entertainers in consuming wine, might be predisposed. Their condition would make water taste like wine, and so their imaginations would give the effects of its imbibition increased potency. For Beyschlag the incident showed Jesus' power over minds. The fluid was itself unchanged, but those who drank it were entranced and perhaps half hypnotized, and so were made to think it wine and excellent. Thus Jesus was really bringing the guests out of their state of semi-inebriation by working a most commendable illusion. The more conservative Weiss says in substance that Jesus only ordered the jars filled, and then stood aside while God the omnipotent did the great work of transformation.

Besides its inherent and utter incredibility as a fact, the richness and appositeness of it as a symbol of many things must convince every candid and insightful mind that we have here a group of ideas and feelings clothing themselves in the form of a physical process. As an allegory rather than as a fact it is all most pregnant and pertinent. Keim suggests that it means that Judaism had no more wine, but must be supplemented by the Christian water of purification and baptism, made here still more effective as a type of spiritual wine. Again Jesus was no fasting ascetic, but a bringer of joy ineffable, such as the marriage of the faithful to the heavenly Bridegroom brings. Thus we have here the keynote to his ministry as he steps into publicity out from the shadow of the Baptist. Again, it has been conceived as an intermediate step between ceremonial washing and the complete cleansing with Jesus' blood, while the festive wine is prelusive of the joy of the Holy Ghost. Jesus' nature had just undergone a transformation from humanity to conscious divinity, well typified by changing water to wine. To his new theanthropic consciousness all nature and life were also thus and thereby sublimated, as if from aqueous to vinous. Wine exalts, and his own experience had brought his soul into a more or less ecstatic state illustrative of the higher powers of man or a kind of second breath reinforcement. It was prelusive of the sacrament of communion to be later established. The magic metamor-

phosis has a wedding as its background, because the miracle of love typified how Jesus' soul had just been wedded to God, and so it is a symbol of the soul's union with the All-Father. This wine was the culminating and the best, and especially satisfying after other poorer wines, just as the thirst of Jesus' soul had been completely slaked by the water of eternal life after partaking of which no one ever thirsts again. If we thus conceive the material as swallowed up in a new dispensation of higher spiritual truths the incident is not only saved from scoffers but may be used for those whose souls suffer from Silberer's[1] apperceptive insufficiency and who must take hold of great and high truths by some symbolic handle. Every item fits this kind of interpretation, and people are more prone to cling to factual events just so far as they fail to see and feel the power of their higher and transcendent significance, so that literal belief often involves loss of the power of higher spiritual insight. Whether the Cana incident was a moving pictograph, dream, or revery in Jesus' soul, or evolved collectively in the Johannin group of his followers after his death, it certainly has very many determinants, so that its interpretation is obvious and its form easily explicable. Because it was so surcharged with meaning, its crassification into a banal fact was to have been expected by those who realize how tropes thus charged with multifarious significance are inevitably literalized, because the mind vaguely feels vastly more than it can understand. This we now can see pretty well by the suggestions that have come to myth-study from a psychoanalysis of the psychological laws that govern such formations. The precise point at which this is placed, viz., just after Jesus' call to Divine Sonship and his acceptance of it, was admirably chosen. At the same time, this makes it suspicious as a narrative of an objective happening, but luminous and *bientrouvé* as an effective, dramatic, rhetorical, pedagogic device.

It is not entirely satisfactory to regard this record as the manifest content of a collective dream of the inner Johannin circle of Jesus' followers, possibly based on some trivial incident, or perhaps a *de novo* creation of the seer of that circle which came to be adopted by it. As alchemy sought to change baser metal into gold, and was itself motivated by every deep aspiration of all its devotees and enmeshed in countless allegorical meanings, so this fluid alchemy of water into wine

[1] "Probleme der Mystik und ihrer Symbolik." Wien, 1914, 283 p.

was not a parable or vision, but an apologue of spiritual transformation converted downward until it seemed anchored to fact. It was set forth with due *Rücksicht auf Darstellbarkeit* so that it might conceivably be made into a miracle play showing Jesus as the most conspicuous exemplifier of the higher powers of man and of the now ecstatic state on which he had entered after the baptism, and to which his former life was as moonlight to sunlight, or as water to wine. For such a miracle we have no name. Neither ideo-, mytho-, or thumo-gram is quite fit. It is in fact a parable fossilized, a purely psychic structure with not the slightest element of objective or historic truthfulness in the world of fact. It is thus twice a miracle, first in that it was a new and original pedagogic masterpiece in embodying a momentous new, meaningful insight, viz., that of the new and higher life about to be revealed by Jesus' words and deeds. The necessity of expressing a new psychic content is sometimes so great that the crassest terms of its utterances give relief and come to be believed because they are absurd, for only absurdity can adequately utter novelty. Secondly, such a structure as this is an almost ideal test and measure of psychic and religious insight. The moron type of comprehension regards it as a kind of fact fetish, while to the higher type of comprehension it reveals itself as what it really is—a splendid trope of a profoundly characteristic religious experience. The religious fetishist, however, we must not forget, has an important function, viz., that of conserving the form in which many precious meanings are wrapped up unchanged from age to age; while, on the other hand, if all saw only the content the form would be slowly dissipated and thus that precious content lost. Thus we have here a congeries of normal complexes standardized and conserved by what we call orthodoxy, embodying a new and transforming point of view, desiccated and mummified but resurrectable in any soul vital enough to transmute baser, sarcous into higher, pneumatic elements.

The early Church must have felt this impulse to enshrine spiritual meanings in marvellous tales, because the lives of the saints, thousands of whom the Bolandists have recorded during the last four centuries, are a welter of so-called miracles of edification which are psychic constructions once of great heuristic value but now rendered ineffective by science. Such writers took liberties with nature's uniformity, as poetic license does with syntax and grammar, and felt justified in so doing in order to convey higher meanings; for new wine must be put

into new bottles. The Cana marvel, however, was no product of caprice or wanton individual fancy, but an almost inevitable construction of zeal in its first intention for propagating Gospel truth. As great situations bring forth great men, so these products of expositorial energumens struck out as by a spark of genius an incident that precisely filled and fitted all things, because, while couched in terms of sense, they really say things only to the subconscious intuition. Such a happening becomes in a sense a new technical term well adapted for general currency. While, if considered as a mere factual event, it serves admirably as a religious fool-finder, it makes its own deeper appeal to the affectivity and autistic nature of all in whom this deeper stratum of psychic life exists.

(b) *The Miraculous Draught of Fishes.*—According to Matthew and Mark, Jesus saw Simon Peter and Andrew fishing and said, Follow me and I will make you fishers of men. Farther on he saw James and John mending nets, called them, and they left their father and followed him. Luke, however, has a fuller and very different account. Pressed by the crowd, Jesus came upon two empty fishing boats and had the owner of one take him aboard and push out a little from the shore because of the crowd, and taught, sitting in it. When he had finished he told the obliging owner of the boat to put out and cast his net, indicating the place. Doubtless because he had caught nothing all night, Peter remonstrated, and then yielded, catching so many fish that the nets broke and they called the second pair of fishermen brothers to their aid. Both boats were filled with fish to the sinking point. All were astonished, and Simon with characteristic impulsiveness fell at Jesus' feet, saying, Depart from me, Master, for I am a sinner. Jesus replied, Fear not but have faith; thou shalt catch men. Having landed, they forsook all and followed him.

Thus the miraculous draft of fishes is in Luke only and he tells it apparently to explain what seemed to him a greater marvel, viz., why according to the earlier reports, four hard-working fishermen should on the instant leave all to follow a stranger. According to Luke, they had felt the spell of Jesus' discourse, which might well have been on the symbolism or higher parable-like meaning of the vocation his lakeside audience knew best. They had also had a demonstration of his strange and uncanny power to locate fish, and by the use of it had certainly acquired a tiny fortune. In Matthew and Mark the call and the obe-

dience to it by this quaternion of fishermen seems a psychological miracle of almost hypnotic will-compelling power, while Luke finds a natural motivation in a physical miracle, a distinct step downward showing both Jesus and these disciples in a weird light. Jesus' personal power over the will of others is lessened, while the alacrity of obedience with which the call is obeyed suggests an element of sordidness.

It has been asked why, when convinced of Jesus' power to locate fish as they could not, they did not urge him to enter their calling instead of leaving it themselves on the moment of their greatest success. Some have assumed a bargain by which Jesus promised to return and repeat the miracle from time to time, so that they would really catch more fish if they spent the interim with him, on which view of course their allegiance was bought, or they were freed for a time by the great haul to follow their inclinations. Carpers have objected that whatever may be true of shad, herring, and mackerel in the sea, fish never assemble so densely in a lake of this size as to make such catches as are here described possible, and also that the fish now in this lake do not do so. It has even been argued that all of the species of fish which had this peculiar instinct of flocking together were here caught and their race made extinct. At any rate, we are told that fish in this lake now show no such habits. Another view is that Jesus noticed the shoal of fish when he was speaking, and when he was through naturally called Simon's attention to it; while still another commentator urges that the multitude had drawn the fish together in great numbers by throwing crumbs from their lunch into the water. Still another says that if it was a true miracle Jesus must have had not merely the power to perceive but to gather fish as Orpheus did beasts; that such was Jesus' magnetic charm that even aquatic forms of life were attracted, indicating a sympathy of nature with supreme virtue, although it has been objected that this was inconsistent with other intimations that Jesus felt kindly toward birds and flowers while he lured the poor fish to their destruction.

All this materialization of metaphors and allegories, so characteristic of infantilism, is at the same time pathetic and full of the charm of naïveté, and so at the other extreme is the pedantic skepticism as to whether the first disciples were really ever fishermen at all, but that the typological force of the analogy between fish and making

converts transformed their vocation as well as invented the miracle. The Kingdom is a net, gathering good and bad, to be sorted later. Max Müller, Coxe, Kühn, and many others have abundantly shown how metaphors do often tend to be taken literally and so become the germ of mythology, and how spiritual meanings tend, as by a law of psychic gravity, to lower literal and material levels. Of this law we must conclude that we have here another illustration, and that the power of Jesus' discourse in the boat and the enthusiasm of a newly awakened consciousness of a great redemptive work in these four men who now perhaps come over from John's mission, now put vividly into terms of their own calling, rather than a command to follow reinforced by a miracle, made them devote themselves to Jesus' Messianism. In this view all becomes natural and in full accordance with the higher laws of psychodynamics.

What a better rhetorician or even historian than the Evangelists would have said is that Jesus in calling the first four disciples managed to impress them with the idea that he could teach them object-lesson-wise to draw crowds as he had done, as if (in the sense of Vaihinger's philosophy *des als ob*) he were to teach them where always to find shoals of fish awaiting them. That they had caught nothing all the night before was a doubly determined symbol, first of the night preceding contrasted with the day in which they now were, symbolized by Jesus' new life and his presence; secondly, their utter failure to catch anything typified their previous inability to impress themselves upon men. But this was offset, thirdly, by the implication that under his guidance they should draw crowds as they had filled their boats with fish. Thus we have some insight as to the inner motivation that impelled them on the instant at his behest to follow Jesus, which the more laconic First and Second Gospels do not give, and we are able to obviate the vulgarity and increase the power for edification of the incident if taken literally and crassly. In this Jesus was more than a clairvoyant fish-finder. If this had been all, he might have been a god of fishermen, or thought to be a god of fishes themselves. We can perhaps better understand, if not entirely sympathize with, the marvellous power which the fish symbol ἰχθύς, as an anagram for *Jesous Christos Theou Uios Soter* has. The symbol has been overloaded with meanings hitherto not understood or explained. Here again it needed but a slight insight into the psychological laws that govern the workings of

the soul to save the Church from ages of gross materialism of faith and of taking purely natural psychic process for a physical and sensuous prodigy. If Jesus' phrase, fishers of men, was aptly pedagogic and effective with these followers, it is easily carried too far as the Church has often done. To fish for converts is in no sense the best trope for bringing men to Christianity. It not only suggests Jesuitism and artifice where utter sincerity and candour should be, but, pushed a step too far, breaks down as a simile, for fish are not benefited but destroyed by being caught, while men are caught for their everlasting betterment.

(c) *The Feeding.*—Famine during the Exodus had been relieved miraculously by manna and quails. In the great drouth under Ahab, Elijah prevented the meal of his widowed hostess from wasting or her oil from failing. So when Elisha's hundred disciples suffered famine, twenty barley loaves and a little crude corn were made sufficient by a miracle. The supper, too, that Jesus instituted the last evening of his life, consisted in the breaking and distribution of bread, and the arisen Jesus was first recognized as he broke bread with his disciples in the same characteristic way as he had done at the sacrament when instituting the supper, which was itself a counterpart of the feeding with manna and quails. The latter is told twice, too, in the Old Testament and so there is a second somewhat diverse miracle of marvellous feeding reported by Matthew and by Mark. In the first the Twelve had just returned from their first mission, and Jesus wished to retire with them; but crowds followed, and Jesus taught and healed. But toward the evening the disciples suggested that the multitude be sent away out of the wilderness to buy food in the villages. Jesus commanded to feed them, and was asked if the disciples should buy two hundred pence worth of bread. Asking what provisions they had, he was told five barley loaves and two small fishes. He then commanded that the people be made to sit on the grass in an orderly way, took the bread, blessed it, looked up to heaven and passed it to the disciples to give to the multitude. All ate and were filled, and they gathered twelve baskets full of fragments. This marvel is told by all four of the Evangelists, all of whom agree on the above figures and also in the estimate that there were some five thousand people present.

In the second miraculous feeding (Matthew and Mark only) the multitude numbered four thousand, and had been with Jesus for three days. He had compassion upon them because in the wilderness they

had nothing to eat. Seven loaves and a few small fishes were all that could be found in the larder of the disciples. Taking these viands and giving thanks, Jesus handed them to the disciples to be distributed. All were filled, and seven baskets full were gathered up. Luke omits this second miracle, and John seems to compound the two. In the wilderness Jesus had been tempted by hunger, and John makes Jesus ask Philip, "Whence shall we buy bread that these can eat?" to test him. The people after eating said, This is of truth that prophet that should come into the world. In the second miracle, too, Jesus had just preached and healed. John is always ready to modulate from the literal to the spiritual aspect and *vice versa*. As for Hegel the real is the rational and the rational is the real, so to John all things symbolic of higher meanings are real and *vice versa*. Barley, too, was the cheapest bread, and fish the commonest food in that region.

Many have asked when the actual miracle of increase took place—in the hands of Jesus during his prayer or in the hands of the disciples as they distributed the food, or in the hands or mouths of the multitude. Assuming the first as most in the spirit of the narrative, Strauss asks whether the loaves and fishes were multiplied in number as they came one after another from Jesus' hand, or whether each loaf grew to satisfy one fifth of the multitude and to supply two and four tenths of the twelve baskets of fragments. Here expositors vie with one another in shifts and evasions to rid themselves of so embarrassing a miracle or to make it more palatable to faith. Did the people follow Jesus, not to hear him or even to be healed, but rather to be fed in a bread-line? Did they know of the miracle, or think Jesus a generous almoner of food that he had provided himself? Only John suggests that they knew; and would it not have been wiser on Jesus' part to let them know? Perhaps he gave a hospitable lunch which was afterward conceived as supernatural.

Finally, the fact that the fragments are gathered with care that nothing be left suggests more than economy, for the early Church held that the loss of the smallest fragment of the eucharistic body of Our Lord was almost sacrilege. Twelve baskets would be one for each disciple, and the seven baskets in the second feeding may have been suggested by the number of loaves which were on hand, or of the seven deacons that served the sacred elements in the early *agapæ*.

This miracle involves nothing less than the creation of food. The

supply is increased about a thousandfold. The grain, and perhaps fish, came into existence on the spot and at a moment, ready cooked. The conventional exegetes have long had recourse to their favourite phrase of accelerated processes by the Lord, to whom a thousand years are as one day. But he also established seed-time and harvest. He might create a new world, but to abrogate his own laws implies that they were inadequate to support the higher spiritual development in the new order of things. Moreover, Jesus had refused to make stone into bread for himself, and why should he do it for others? This miracle is plainly a rough-hewn allegory of heavenly bread or treasure that grows by being spent, and we must not substitute the letter for the spirit. Jesus would lift men above the sense of hunger or appetite generally. Some have suggested that in the crowd were those who had a surplus of food, and that they were moved by hospitality or brotherly love to forget social barriers and share their store with others. Fellowship may not satisfy hunger, but it may make men forget it. Very common is the suggestion that Jesus fed the souls of his hearers so full of heavenly bread by his teaching that physical hunger was forgotten, and his slender stores of food were not eaten but merely broken. Keim figures that Jesus' achievement here was two hundred times greater than that of Elisha, who fed one hundred sons of the prophets on twenty barley loaves, for here five thousand were fed with five.

(d) *Tempest.*—In one thrice-told tale it was decided to cross the Lake of Galilee, and after they had put out there was a great storm that seemed about to swamp the ship, while Jesus lay in the stern asleep on a pillow. The disciples awoke him, asking him whether he cared not if they perished, and called upon him to save them. He ascribed their fear to lack of faith, and then rebuked the winds and raging waves saying, Peace, be still, and there was a great calm. The people feared and marvelled, asking one another what manner of man he was that winds and waves obeyed him.

In what is apparently another incident, told by all four of the Evangelists, Jesus sent the disciples across the same Lake of Galilee while he remained behind to send the multitude away, and then retired to pray, John says to escape being made a king by force. By evening the ship was in the midst of the lake and tossed by angry billows, and in the fourth watch of the night when, John says, they were

twenty-five or thirty leagues off shore, they saw Jesus walking toward them on the water, and Mark says they thought he was a ghost. To calm their new terror he called out, It is I, be not afraid; although one report says he made at first as though he would go by. Peter said, If it is thou, call me to come to thee, and he was called to come; but after starting he became afraid and began to sink, crying, Lord, save me. Then Jesus caught him by the hand, rebuked his doubt, and both entered the ship, and the wind ceased although John says, "Immediately the ship was at the land whither they went" as if it were miraculously transported over the twenty-five or thirty leagues, and that the people glorified him as the Son of God. Mark says: "They considered not the miracle of the loaves; for their hearts were hardened." When they had landed, all the sick in the villages and country and the cities round about were brought, and as many as touched even the hem of his garment were made whole.

In the first incident Jesus' sleep after a hard day's work brings into effective contrast divine repose and the distress of earth. When called in panic and extremity, both wind and wave sank to peace as if bowed by his presence and rebuke. He did not pray, but commanded as God did of old the waters of the Red Sea. He had a control no less than magical over both raging elements and perturbed souls. In the other lake tale Mark makes Jesus about to pass by as a stranger, as if he had not seen or thought of the ship; but he responded to a call to come aboard, whereupon the wind ceased of itself without command, as if in obedience to his unspoken wish, although he had apparently not smoothed his own path over the rough waves, upon which his footing must have been most precarious. Here Jesus is not asleep, but absent, and the implication is that had he been awake or present the elements would not have broken forth from their bounds. As to Peter's venture, some think it a later and spurious interpolation. Lange curiously accommodates by saying that Peter "was perhaps a high-water treader," but that the waves were so high they compelled him to swim and finally threatened to submerge him. Oelshausen thinks Jesus' water walking was a case of levitation or rarefaction of the body, and that the incident favours Docetism, or that his corporeal nature had already begun to undergo progressive etherization. Paulus says that probably the disciples falsely thought they saw him. Venturini suggests that Jesus was really on shore, and in the dawn or

mist and fog which enwrapped him he seemed to be out at sea. This is favoured by John's account of the speedy landing, and so we are told Jesus really drew Peter out of the shallow water in which he was floundering and wading very near the shore.

These scenic miracles have many parallels, ancient and modern, like the Philopedes who ran over the green Ægean Sea with cork-shod feet, escorting ships far out to sea. There are also many Old Testament parallels. In Psalm 107 the restoration from captivity is described as a sailor brought to land from a tempest. Yahveh raised a strong wind, and they cried to the Lord, and he saved them. So Jesus is made to factualize this symbolic imagery. Hengstenberg thinks that thus insights suggested by ancient writers were often realized, rather than that this realization was never effected at all by Jesus but fictitiously ascribed to him later. The figure of the tempest soon came to refer predominantly not to ancient days but to the tribulations of the early Church, and even if there were no nuclear incident, some such tale was likely to be told of Jesus because of its tropical value. "The Lord makes a way on the sea, a path in the mighty waters," and Job said, "he walks upon the sea as on a floor." He calms perturbed minds, comes to his friends in their hour of need. In a sharper and more acuminated way he helps on the instant the failing faith of one who with characteristic sudden impulsiveness essayed more than he could accomplish, and this is a sweet assurance that comes home to the heart. Socrates had taught that no real evil could befall the good man, living or dead; but Jesus here shows himself a very present personal help in time of trouble. If the embodiment of this fond hope and wish were couched in even more impossible terms it would have been too precious to be sloughed off or thrown into the rubbish heap of vulgar superstition.

The heuristic meat most often found here is in Peter's venture, his failure and rescue, which Goethe thought a beautiful illustration of the fact that man succeeds in desperate undertakings if only he has faith and courage, while if he lacks confidence he fails. Again, it teaches that man's extremity is God's opportunity. Something like this is the only moral *haec fabula docet.* We also see how inferior Jesus is to Yahveh in controlling nature, as he is superior to him in dealing with human affairs. Jesus does not bring storm and rain, stop the sun, control thunder, cleave the sea, shake the earth, bring floods, but his domain is the body and soul of man.

Davies[1] makes forty-six miracles, but fourteen of these are allusions found in one or more of the Gospels where various cures are asserted, but which he thinks refer to at least fourteen groups of more or less miscellaneous healing, and there are many phrases indicating that very large numbers had been cured. "He healed all that were sick." "He healed many that were sick of divers diseases." They brought the sick to him and "he laid his hands on every one of them and healed them." "Devils also came out of many, crying out." He went through all Galilee, preaching and casting out devils. "Healing all manner of disease." "The whole multitude sought to touch him: for there went virtue out of him and healed them all." "They brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic and those that had the palsy; and he healed them." He cured many of their infirmities and plagues, and of evil spirits; and unto many that were blind he gave sight. "And Jesus went about all Galilee teaching in their synagogues and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease." "Healed them that had need of healing." "They brought unto him all that were diseased, and besought him that they might only touch the hem of his garment: and as many as touched were made perfectly whole." "And great multitudes came unto him having with them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed, and many others, and cast them down at Jesus' feet; and he healed them."

These general statements concerning many miracles are all of healing and none of nature wonders, and the query arises why if Jesus cured so many on what principle it was that those above more circumstantially described were singled out from the others.

The impression made by Jesus' miracles on those who were eye-witnesses to them was very diverse. As to *the disciples*, at the draught of fishes Peter was profoundly awed, crying, "Depart from me for I am a sinful man," and to him and the other three disciples then chosen, who seemed to have accepted their call because of the impression this wonder made on them, Jesus said, "Fear not." John said that the disciples believed in him at and after the Cana miracle. They seem soon to expect healing miracles and to accept them almost as a matter of course, and were more inclined to bring Jesus and his patients

[1] "The Miracles of Jesus." London, 1913, 240 p.

together than to protect him from their importunity. In healing they seem to have regarded themselves as in a sense apprentices to the art, and Jesus as their master. In stilling the tempest they were rebuked for faithlessness, and when he came to them walking on the water they feared again, and, Matthew said, confessed him to be the Son of God; and Mark, that their hearts were hardened and that they had not considered the miracle of the loaves. This suggests that the disciples were not inclined to believe but rather to doubt the nature miracles, or at least that they were not wonted to them. They had no intimation beforehand that he could or would raise Lazarus, and when told of the reports of Jesus' own Resurrection thought them idle tales. On the whole, it appears that the disciples, while expecting him to perform certain cures, emulated his power to do so. By the nature and resuscitation miracles they were amazed, but far from being convinced that he was divine because of them. Nor did they ever attempt to emulate him in performing these except in the case of Peter's walking on the water. Thus the Evangelists have not made the disciples react to these greater marvels as normal human nature should and must, and this constitutes another source of doubt whether they ever occurred or were really seen by the disciples. They were later completely convinced, though gradually and in stages, that Jesus had arisen; but the raising of Lazarus and the nature wonders left no trace on their lives such as they must have done had they really occurred. They never expected them beforehand, and never believed in them later, because they never saw them.

As to the *patients*, those healed at a distance seem not to have known that Jesus had anything to do with their cure. Those resurrected seemed dazed, but we are told almost nothing of them after their resuscitation. Some of those healed went their way without even giving thanks, while others overwhelmed him with gratitude and some desired to become his followers. It was the demoniac who first of all and unreservedly confessed and proclaimed him divine. John's congenital blind man courageously protested Jesus' power, braving even the Pharisees to do so. Some of the sick had most earnestly entreated him to cure them, while the demoniacs most violently resisted cure. Some had indomitable faith, and some none. The friends and relatives of those cured were most uniformly true to human nature in their conduct.

It would seem that Jesus would have the warmest of all places in

the hearts of those he healed. To their cure his fame among the populace was chiefly due. But even the friends of those to whom he gratuitously dispensed physical salvation have left no very tangible token of gratitude, and seem to have made no offerings, although some seem to have spent their substance on other healers, and none of the latter appeared desirous of learning the potent secret of the Great Physician. These patients restored to health must, according to the Gospel implication, have been very many. They and their relatives were among the first and most ardent believers, but little influence seems ever to have emanated from them in Jesus' behalf even in his hours of trial. Had they numbered hundreds or thousands, it would seem that they and the multitude of those who had seen and known of the cures must have constituted an element of more influence upon Jesus' life than we are told they had. Mary Magdalene, out of whom seven devils were cast, seems to have yielded with abandon to the sentiment of gratitude and love to a degree that illustrates the Freudian "transfer." But many of those, like, e. g., the nine lepers, seem to have gone their way as if desiring to have their disease and its cure forgotten. No others who had convalesced under his influence were in his train of followers. Nor did he choose those who had been rescued from a sinful life by a great salvation. In Paul's life and teaching healing played little more than a metaphorical rôle, nor in the patristic writers does it loom up as in the Evangelists. All these considerations indicate again that it was exaggerated.

As for the *scribes and Pharisees*, who were often present or told afterward (as in the case of Lazarus and elsewhere), they were never convinced but jealous and enraged, and the more manifest the miraculous power the more they sought to destroy Jesus. From the accomplishment of this their chief end they were restrained by fear because the people favoured Jesus while they censured him, not because he had healed, but because he had healed on the Sabbath day, and again because he had arrogated to himself divine power by forgiving sins. The scribes, Pharisees, priests, and elders, these were his implacable enemies seeking to entangle him in his words, to incite the people against him, and to take him by craft. Their attitude was that he was an impostor and pretender. Renan thinks it was their machinations that really checked Jesus' career prematurely. They bargained with Iscariot, accused him, sent officers to arrest him, suborned false witnesses,

testified him to Pilate, taunted him on the cross, bribed the soldiers to say that his body had been stolen. He was followed by their implacable hate from first to last, and while accepting some of his cures they explained them by assuming him to be in league with the devil. Thus they, at least, were convinced of no other miracles than these which by implication they did admit in certain cases, and which they, too, had some power to do.

Apologists for the Jewish hierarchy urge that its rancour has been exaggerated, especially in the early part of Jesus' career, and that he was comparatively unknown at Jerusalem, entering that city only near the close of his ministry; that his fame was chiefly Galilean, and that it was the gentile propaganda of Paul that intensified opposition and made an atmosphere in which every divergence that arose later was put back into Jesus' lifetime and exaggerated. According to this view, the Gospels do injustice to the representatives of Jewish orthodoxy by seeking to magnify Jesus' influence and make it far more formidable than it became during his life. We are told that the acclaim of his entrance into Jerusalem and the attention he received there were exaggerated, and also that there were real grounds in his teaching and deeds for accusing him of sedition; while his caustic and unpolitic vituperations made him seem not only a heretic but a fanatic to impartial minds in the holy city, who knew him only from without, and saw chiefly his unique genius for making enemies, which Pilate quite failed to understand. Jesus' torrid outbursts of indignation, the imprecations expressed in the woes he launched, awful as the curse of Rome by Richelieu or the excommunication formula of the synagogue hurled later against Spinoza—these it was not in human nature to endure. Hence his death was even more inevitable than that of Socrates, and the misrepresentation of him by his enemies was more exaggerated than that of Socrates by the sophists, whom the later historians of Greek philosophy have done much to reinstate without thereby dimming the lustre of the great hebamic artist of ancient Athens. Jesus, although he made no such apology as Socrates did, claiming that instead of death he should be supported by a pension, nevertheless deemed himself as good a citizen as Socrates did. Surely, Jesus, black as he is made to have painted these villains in the drama of his life, would never have sanctioned the way or degree in which his persecutors and their descendants have become the persecuted during the Christian

centuries. How could a Jewish Messiah, the proclaimer of the gospel of love, have foreseen, much less have left behind him, this legacy of hate instead?

Finally, the *multitude* generally present, like the chorus of the old Greek tragedy, performed a not very dissimilar function. They were amazed, murmured, believed, praised God, acknowledged Jesus to be his Son, and were generally favourable and prone to believe, though sometimes divided in opinion and also eager to profit by being fed or having their friends cured.

They are not only less often present, but are less responsive, and their reactions were less natural perhaps, or merely conventional, even in the presence of the most stupendous wonders, to which the recorded responses are not unlike those evoked by marvels within the range of possible psychotherapy. In general, the more inexplicable the prodigy, the less the number of those who saw it or the less they said about it, suggesting that they were impressionable sensation seekers to whom the Great Healer was only a transient object of fickle curiosity, without dreaming of the higher spiritual meanings of which the miracles were symbols. Else why were these regions where Jesus did most of his mightiest works and where the new Gospel was preached, of which he was the centre, not those most favourable for his doctrine to take quickest and deepest root? Why was this not the ground chosen for the first and most effective preaching after Pentecost? Common sense would surely indicate that this would be the richest soil, for here personal reminiscences of Jesus and the best things he said and did were freshest. This would certainly seem to have constituted a unique field for a propaganda, but it seems to a great extent to have been unutilized and left to go to waste. The seed Jesus planted here was unharvested. This again suggests that there may have been an exaggeration of marvels.

In the cure of the blind man, the leper, the raising of Jairus's daughter, the Transfiguration, etc., secrecy is enjoined, but usually in vain, while some patients are taken apart as if to prevent publicity. But the injunction to secrecy is never said to have been observed, and in the case of some of the lesser, and even the greater, miracles like walking on the water and raising Lazarus, no such injunction is recorded. Many miracles are done before the multitude, as all should have been if they were chiefly credentials of Messianity; and there is no

more reason or consistency among the different wonders in Jesus' seeking or avoiding publicity than in his now wishing and now being reluctant to do miracles. Many motives for enjoining silence have been conjectured, viz., Jesus' mortification at having to validate himself, his word, and his work in this way when he desired to do so by his doctrine chiefly or alone. Again, he may have objected because he saw that his wonders were being used as advertisements and drew crowds excessively large which made too great drafts upon his time and energy. Again, it may have been due to a wish on his part to reserve some miracles to the narrower and more esoteric circle of his disciples and friends, and that he thus made a distinction between the mass of spectators and the acolytes closest to him. Again, it has been ascribed to a desire not to offend the Pharisees too greatly or prematurely, since these seemed especially to exasperate them. Again, we might assume that they were really natural though striking deeds of a kind which, he feared, if told and retold generally, would grow into supernatural events, and that he had a penetrating intuition that in his social environment he was in grave danger of what he abhorred, viz., being regarded as a breaker or suspender of natural laws, thus anticipating and seeking to prevent just the fate that he suffered. On this latter view, Jesus forbade gossip when he thought it would lead to an exaggeration which would become eventually untruth. Again, to-day it is often the patient who wishes the doctor to be silent about his trouble and its cure, but there is no intimation that Jesus desired his cures concealed in the interests of the patient. Nor was it that he had private methods or remedies, as Paulus suggested, such as would to-day be patentable, and which he desired to keep to himself and to his disciples.

If the Evangelists had a subconscious sense that they were misrepresenting what their master really did, then their dim compunction might well express and also ease itself by representing Jesus as forbidding that it be told at all, knowing in their own hearts that he would not have sanctioned their mode of telling it. Thus they tended to atone for the injustice their inmost conscience felt they were doing him while telling what, to them, was an improvement on the exact historic truth. Moreover, by assigning this dread of publicity to Jesus more colour was given to their intimation that there were many other unreported miracles concerning which his injunction of silence had

been observed. If knowledge of some of these leaked out despite his wish, surely the latter would be effective in the case of other of his marvellous doings. In fact, though he did nothing to merit the fame of the thaumaturgist and was both unable and unwilling to do anything to bring this fame upon himself, he knew his *clientèle*, and that the proclivities of his age were in this direction. He had a haunting dread that he would be misconceived and misrepresented just here, and this feeling on his part is reflected to us in the Evangelists under the disguised form of representing him as trying to keep real miracles secret.

From this new angle of approach, therefore, indications seem to converge to the conclusion that Jesus did heal certain neuropaths and psychopaths who abounded about him, and also that his rarely impressive personality, backed by great local fame, caused at least temporary betterment in some cases of other kinds. We see modern confirmations of this in vulgar contemporary healers like Slater, Dowie, and even in the occasional successes of the most arrant and knavish medical quacks and charlatans, in which scientific psychology is finding rich new material, while the higher forms of faith- and mind-cure also tend to bring such cases within the range of natural law and to save them from wholesale rejection as superstitious. On the other hand, these selfsame modern instances teach us how very slight and transient betterments of this kind tend almost inevitably to grow in the mind of the patient, and also by being told and retold, to grow into marvels that are preposterous and absurd, and how readily a mole-hill may become a mountain and credulity make a grain of mustard seed into a great tree. Not only were there, in fact, no other mighty works save these healings done by Jesus, but, as we saw above, the surfaces of cleavage between them and all the other spurious wonder tales are still traceable. The disciples could heal in *modo magistri*, but were directed, were able, and wished, to do no other miracle. The physical marvels of the Old Testament order died out with Jesus. The fact that the disciples cured, marvellously invalidated these cures of Jesus as proofs of his Messianity, and therefore the Evangelists had to stress those of other kinds, or else Jesus could no longer be thought divine because of his supernatural power. Unless he outdid his disciples, they were as divine as he so far as the range of this kind of attestation went. Had the disciples not developed some of his power to heal, therefore, one motive of representing Jesus as outdoing them and pass-

ing beyond the realm of what is possible to man would have been absent. Again, as we saw above, the really supernatural doings of Jesus either left no traces on the minds and hearts of his disciples or else caused fear and aversion, the diametrical opposite of the effect the normal cures made upon them; and only in the age of the Evangelists, and by them, was the attitude of the disciples toward the superhuman achievements of Jesus reversed. The stone the disciples rejected became to the Evangelists the chief stone of the corner.[1]

Thus, to summarize, geneticism gives us a new interpretation of the miracles of Jesus which, while accepting all the negative results of antisupernatural criticism, at the same time gives them a novel and precious significance, and invests them with a value even greater than they held before. As objective facts capable of cinematographic reproduction they are one and all (save only certain cases of curing or bettering certain types of disease, to which we have modern parallels) as false to both nature and history as hippogriffs, centaurs, phoenixes, or the most fantastic exploits of the denizens of Olympus or Walhalla. In the literal sense in which the synoptists record and orthodoxy accepts them, they are as untrue as dreams or hallucinations, and would have been no less abhorrent to Jesus than was the formal sanctimoniousness or the hypocritical piety against which he launched his most impassioned invectives. How he shrank from the reputation of a thaumaturgist even the Gospel writers who invested him with it did not have the wit to disguise, but involuntarily betray it to us in their recitals, as we have seen.

Again, miracles have never been entirely assimilated by the Christian consciousness, but have remained as foreign bodies in it, perhaps more or less encysted in its system of doctrine. They have always necessitated a double housekeeping and more or less dualization of mind. Over against a world of reason and science based on the senses, they require as a postulate another order of things with its own organ, faith, which is created for their special conservation. Where natural and supernatural impinge or collide, the latter is supreme. We have to pass from the cosmos to an epicosmic world, and between the two we must evolve a watertight compartment, building a coffer-dam, as it were, about certain articles of faith which the

[1] See J. R. Illingworth: "The Gospel Miracles," 1915, 213 p.; H. Huelster: "Miracles in the Light of Science and History," 1915, 164 p.; D. M. Rade: "Das Religiöse Wunder." 1899, 87, p.; J. M. Thompson: "Miracles in the New Testament," 1911, 236 p. Also A. Harnack: "Die Apostelgeschichte," 1908, p. 298.

mediaeval Church explicitly, and we implicitly, reserve as taboo to reason. A large part of the entire history of Christian thought has consisted of reciprocal claims, concessions, accommodations, as between these two views of the world, and the rivalry, hate, persecution, and mutual outlawry of their partisans still subsist. Yet even more tragic, perhaps, is the schizophrenia caused by these two trends that exists in so many indiv dual souls. The very bitterness of the champions of ultra-conservatism in religion is due to the fact that they themselves feel heretical promptings in the depths of their souls. In letting loose the *odium theologicum* against skeptics they are really seeking to suppress by force nascent doubts in themselves. The apostles of science, on the other hand, in pouring out the vials of their scorn upon believers have also done violence to their own souls and have come to falsely think themselves irreligious when, in fact, an undevout scientist, who spends his life in thinking God's thoughts after him in the world of nature and mind, would be, as the proverb has it, mad if he were really undevout.

To this tragic schism or bifurcation of the soul geneticism comes as a mediator and unifier, accepting all real affirmations of both parties and ignoring only their negations. Both are right, and each is a conservator of the truth, but in different ways. The error of both is lack of insight into the nature of the human soul. Genetic analytic psychology comes forward as a reconciler, doing justice to both sides and violence to neither, and asserting even for miracles and before the tribunal of science, a new and higher value, while at the same time denying to them every vestige of objective reality. On what ground do we base this great and paradoxical claim?

The answer to this question is found in a transforming conception of the nature and functioning of the soul itself. As long as it was conceived as synonymous with consciousness no light could come from this source. On this view reason is built up on the basis of sense perception, and every mental construction is formed in the focus of apperception and takes the predominant form of objectivity. Psychology, to be sure, had a class of objects peculiar to itself; but its method was that of the physical sciences, and to these it looked for its logical norms. The reign of law was so universal that no testimony conceivable could ever prove a miracle. Seeing then would not be believing, but would be merely delusions or hallucinations.

According to the new view of the soul, however, consciousness is only one partial expression of psychic life. It is narrow and limited, if not at bottom corrective and remedial. It is intense only where adjustment is needed or something is liable to go wrong, while most of its activities go on beneath the threshold of consciousness. Much that strives to come into its focus fails to do so, and therefore can find expression, if at all, only in movements or tendencies to move or act, or else in the vast domain of feeling, sentiment, and emotion with their somatic reverberations. There are strivings, trends, wishes, anxieties galore that are perpetually repressed and submerged, and that often express themselves in abnormal ways as symptoms of the many grouped and tabulated kinds that pathology rubricizes. Sometimes these multifarious tendencies, incapable of taking conscious forms, evade the checks that hold them in leash, and appear, perhaps, as over-accentuations of insignificant experiences or objects. In the folk-soul, where the phenomena of individual experience are often rewritten, only in larger and more legible characters, we have a good illustration of this class of happenings in fetishism. Here some insignificant and often chance object is lifted out of its class, made sacred, supercharged with affectivity, and exalted to a significance for life and death itself because overdetermined by becoming a focus of multiform and often submerged associations. These processes and products often seem causeless and senseless, but if the data are accessible so that they can be analyzed, they can always be shown as subject to the severest laws of cause and effect. There is really no such thing as chance in the whole psychic world, sane or insane. The same is true of amatory fetishism. One person, usually in dawning pubesence, is drawn to another of the opposite sex by the deep laws of compensation—which we call love. The elements of the attraction are deep and many, and too intricately complicated for consciousness to grasp, so that before it is recognized as love it may already be far along in its development. To immature minds thus some one trait or feature, hair or ears, gait, voice, or even attire and gesture are focussed on to the exclusion of all the other factors, which remain unconscious while this one completely fills the little stage of apperception itself alone, yet excites every symptom, sensuous and psychic, of love. So, too, totemism illustrates a similar hypertrophy of some special plant, animal, or lifeless object about which it evolves a system of taboos. Again, certain attitudes

or acts are singled out and ritualized, spun about, almost impupated in a felted mesh of symbolic meanings, and made sacrosanct by emotivity, until they become representatives or surrogates of a psychic constituency that is often too multifarious to be individually counted. Stresses and trends of this order give miracles their unique importance. They are made and clung to by psychic processes of the same order as the above, so that the explanation of either throws light upon the others. Miracles are all these together, but more, so that the above only gives us a very general orientation for our quest.

Again, the soul is as laminated as the geological strata which now give us more or less coherent series of fossil remains showing the ascending orders of life, as they evolve, one after another, from lowest to highest, in which we find that many types have become extinct, while many other ancient ones have been conserved to our own day. Just as man arose at a relatively late stage, so consciousness evolved late and slowly out of a long series of preconscious stages of blind impulses and instincts. Man's conscious life to-day is a very recent product, and to be understood must be seen in its indefinite perspective which stretches back to the remotest past. Heredity conserves in our souls as well as in our bodies innumerable vestiges of all our phyletic pedigree, many of which the infant recapitulates in its psychophysic growth. Thus our conscious apperception and rational activities represent the topmost twigs of a vast but buried tree. Now this new psychic mode of rational life is still only partially evolved, and is therefore insecure and unstable. We have no such established equilibrium with our environment as animals have acquired. Hence, our life is not on one level but rather on a steeply inclined plane, and we are incessantly alternating between intense adjustment to the present, in which we are aggressive, alert, apperceptive, pressing on to new knowledge, overcoming obstacles, advancing the kingdom of man, pushing ahead to the unknown goal of life with the whole momentum of the evolutionary nisus behind us, maximizing our strenuosity and efficiency and reinforcing our endeavour; or else, on the other hand, we relax, become passive or backsliders, and revert to older and more autistic types of thought, feeling, and will. Even when most potentialized, man does not dream how atavistic he is and how he is shot through with old veins which outbreak in all he does, says, and feels: how childish, not to say how animal, in his secret heart, and, indeed,

in most of his *tun, sollen, und haben.* To modern psychoanalysis we owe much of the demonstration of this new aspect of life and mind. This is not expressed with entire adequacy by saying that our psychic life is laminated, or that we live on an evolutionary ladder up and down the rungs of which we are constantly moving. It is better to conceive all our conduct and mentation as complexly motivated by features new and old, adult and childish, rational and irrational, conscious and unconscious, so that everything that we do is coloured if not shaped by manifold factors from the immemorial past. Rest, recreation, dreams, and even sleep itself, as well as neuroses and psychoses, are all either wholly or largely reversionary, and therefore often restorative.

Now, during the first few decades after Jesus' death and under the influence of the conviction that he had arisen, the chief impression left by his life and words was that he had brought a new and higher type of living, a sounder, broader view of the world, a unique standard of purity, and that those who followed him would survive death. But all this was as hard to characterize as is the superman for us. Every memory of him, and all he said and did, had not only to be reviewed but radically revised in the light of the Resurrection, which gave the disciples the first plenary conviction of his divinity. Had he remained in the tomb the *memorabilia* of him, had they been written, would have been revised downward. The expectations of his followers would have seemed to be too great, and he would have been regarded only as an earnest, intuitive soul preaching an idealism too good to be practically true, and with some power of healing by his pure and impressive personality. But now that he was certainly a god, all was transformed. Many of his parables dealing with special precepts of the new life, as well as much else that he said, could be recalled, although a good deal was lost owing to the fallibility of memory and the inadequate appreciation of his significance while he was with them. Many things not forgotten could only be inaccurately reproduced. What was, then, the net resultant or the whole burden, the composite photograph, of what he meant to the world?

It was, as we have said, a higher, more devoted, and intense life; but nothing is so hard to characterize or describe. This life involved new ideals, motives, goals, a higher potentialization, and a completeness unmarred by sin. It meant relief from the oppressive sense of inferiority that we all feel when we compare what we are with what

we might have been. It meant a heightening of every power of man, a new dominion of the soul over nature, such as science has actually achieved since: in short, a new and loftier kingdom of man. This was the real core, heart, root and soul of the new Gospel, which must be intensively proclaimed to a careless, inattentive, sordid world; and this must be done at once, for the end of things was near. Never was such a great and pressing heuristic pedagogic problem presented to the mind of man, and those upon whose souls it pressed were by no means ideally fit to solve it. Paul had not known Jesus, and he attempted to reason the matter out according to his lights. But the Evangelists must utilize their memories and traditions of him as he was in life, and had no recourse save to find or make symbols of his message to the world which should, if possible, be connected with his life and made central and integral to it. To this end they utilized the only possible symbols within their reach. The new revelation dispensed to them could all be summed up in the most portative and striking way by saying that the Gospel is like bringing sight to the blind, hearing and speech to deaf mutes, voluntary movement to those who are lame and paralytic, the curing of all specific diseases, feeding the hungry with bread marvellously supplied, changing the water of life to wine, speaking peace to tempest-tossed souls torn by fears and distress and by anxiety, the mother not only of all phobias but, as we now know, of about every psychosis and neurosis, expelling the devils of temptation, bringing perfect sanity, and even raising the moribund or the dead. Such are the best possible tropes and symbols of the *vita nuova* he had brought into the world.

But the Evangelists were no rhetoricians, and figures of speech could not satisfy them. They recalled that Jesus had wrought cures that seemed to them marvels, and that they had imitated him, not without success. Moses and the prophets, too, had done even greater marvels; but Jesus was now proven superior to them all, and doubtless could have done countless greater things than they. His Messianic office, too, required such deeds. He had in very truth done for souls precisely what the miracles they came to ascribe to him typified. During all the years between his death and the composition of our Gospels there was a strong, if unconscious, determining tendency to make him do what it was so desirable that he should have done, and perhaps it was felt that he could hardly have left his followers without so effec-

tive and easily provided means of promulgation, and perhaps would have suffered them had he lived. Under these influences the wonders that he really performed grew inevitably, and perhaps imperceptibly, into what he was finally reported to have done; for the historic sense was undeveloped, and the impulsion to teach, preach, convince, and convert was all dominant. Thus these miracles were no products of fantasy, and are quite unlike all others, whether those done by his successors or ascribed to the founders of other religions, in that they were so multifariously motivated, viz.: (a) by the cures he really did; (b) by the necessities of the Messianic rôle; (c) by Old Testament precedents; (d) by the cataleptic conviction that to a self-resurrected God they would have been easy and natural; (e) by the sense that they were necessary to round out the imperfect records of his life, and therefore, probably, (f) they were pressing necessities of the now absorbing work of making converts; while (g) there was no critical censorship for their unschooled minds, or in their land and age, to prevent this process. Thus these miracles are classics of their kind, and like the Kantian postulates worked well for the early Church, which would have been very different, if it could have even existed at all, without them.

To the synoptists, however, the miracles had become far more than postulates. Indeed, they grew to be the most actual and literal of events. They petrified, embalmed, buried the very spirit of Jesus in these crass materializations, and here for complacent orthodoxy their spirit still lies entombed. Having so supremely satisfied subjective needs, these scenic achievements must conform to such crude criteria of objectivity as were then accessible. These figurate receptacles or imaginal embodiments of precious treasure thus became sacrosanct and inviolable. Like Plato's preëxisting souls imprisoned in bodies, so their soul of meaning was shut up and almost hidden within them. By becoming thus incarnated, if the light went out the heat remained and can still be felt and communicated in the deeper strata of our psychic life. Although conscious reason cannot accept them, they still have a subterranean existence, and still have something to say to *Ahnung* and the deeper intuitions, although outlawed by science. Criticism cannot entirely eject their influences from any soul that has ever been fairly exposed to their infection, and that feels strongly the evolutionary impulsion to a fuller, deeper, better life. Religion in its very nature is reversionary, and so it is conserving and curative by

bringing us back to the older, better organized layers of our psychic life. The best thing about Jesus is that he was the most grown-up of all children, and the most childlike of all men, in the new sense in which we are now understanding the child to be the father of the man. He is the exemplar of the best type of adolescence, most constantly yet temperately inebriated with ideality, and of this supernormal but not superhuman life the so-called miracles are the best symbols.

Thus the synoptists were in a sense undertakers, and the miracles are holy sarcophagi in which the most vital of all truths have been laid away. But, happily, they are only in a state of suspended animation, and the reverence we give them is both because they are mementoes of the past and augurs of the future, when their cerements shall be burst and they shall come forth, as so many of the great dead are thought by the folk to be sleeping till at the appointed moment they awaken to wield again the destinies of man. But if the Gospel writers interred, they also and thereby preserved, these cadavers of truth against the time when their soul should return to them. When they do arise and speak to us, their message is that there was once and will again be a type of human life vastly purer, clearer-minded, stronger-willed, as ready to die as to live as best serves the race, more completely one with the great spirit of life; a new life that seems marvellous only because it is farther on and higher up the evolutionary scale, and compared to which we are like the blind, deaf, crippled, deformed, like those who hunger and thirst, and perhaps even like the dead. Nevertheless, hope and regeneration are possible. They are symbols of Jesus' ecstatic and abounding life, and thus they contain the very heart and soul of the Gospel, and tell us in different allegories only one thing, viz., that a far better, richer, more potent, free, joyous human life has actually existed and can again be in and for us. Although their voice is raucous with long disuse, they call to us again just as Jesus did to his companions, to awake, arise, unlimber the dormant powers in us; to really see, hear, be clean and morally hygienic; to truly speak and say something; to feed our souls with the highest culture and not with gossip of local and personal ephemeralities; to do great deeds, think great thoughts, feel the larger emotions, and thus enter into the kingdom of man's soul, in which we can all do all these miracles upon ourselves. The lesson and moral of the miracles, therefore, is the higher powers of man. They teach that, as Jesus raised himself by his

own pure inner impulsions from a mason-carpenter to Messianity and Divine Sonship and made himself the focus of history, to which so many lines before him converge, and from which they since diverge, thus becoming the greatest leader and light in the world—precisely so all who realize what he was and did can do in and for themselves. They show that there is nothing in his real life not possible to us, according, of course, to our gifts of insight, feeling, and endeavour; for all his powers differ from ours only in degree and not in kind. He was the man in and upon whom all these miracles were truly done. He overcame his own blindness, deafness, immobility of soul, and fed, reanimated, cleansed, and potentialized it. Thus in their spiritual, sublimated sense, the miracles are the rude hieroglyphs of all that he was, did, and said.

Their one and only theme is human dynamogenesis, of which their very oppugnance to law and their impossibility are a flaring advertisement. For centuries before Christ the secret mysteries of the great cults of Thrace, Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt, the scope and impressiveness of which scholarship is now unearthing, celebrated by their inaugurations the death of winter and the revival of spring as realised in the life of man. As cold arrested all the processes of nature and as spring broke the spell and made the world live again, so they thought sin, ignorance, and routine brooded over man's soul, chilled and arrested, while insight, purpose, and enthusiasm were light, heat, wine, and inspiration, intensified to an almost inarticulate extreme in the Pentecostal outpourings, which in the Attic rites degenerated into maenadic frenzy, and here and often elsewhere into amatory calentures. At the heart of all these ancient ceremonies we find regenerative impulsions more or less ritualized and sublimated. Jesus' miracles teach the same thing, only more openly and specifically, and in more constellated yet diversified and portable ways. They are rough emblems of psychic springtide, ugly chrysalids full of the possibilities of new life, if and when vernal influences came; while, after life had burst forth from them, they were but casts or empty shells. Thus, neither the old theology nor the higher criticism can explain Christian regeneration, but are themselves beginning to be explained by geneticism, which sees in this new life a symphony of many parts, the oldest of which is the awakening of nature by spring, the bottom tidal wave beneath all. Upon this are superposed the suggestions that come from dawn

banishing night, and the sun conquering clouds and answering the prayer of the plant and animal world for light. Another factor is food satisfying hunger, with all the higher symbolism which it has suggested to Truro. Then come sex and its spiritualization, love, the greatest thing in the world, with all its wealth of symbols for religion; release or convalescence from the handicap of disease and the cure of traumata; also, self-conquest and control, freed from lameness or paralysis in the new city of psychic hygeia, and so on up to the modern forms of maximal cultural efficiency, anticipating the ideal reconstruction of the material and social world. It is, of course, impossible to tell how much all this excelsior impulsion comes from any one of the series of meristic levels, although the basal factor is older than man. But the conclusion is that the Jesus-cult, if we can only free and utilize it aright, contains the chief promise and potency by which man, still embryonic and always held back by repressive and arrestive influences, can and will some day attain his full maturity.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS

I. The story of the cross the world's masterpiece of pathos—The cross the widest-known symbol—How its story, if vividly told, affects children, neurotics, and others, like Zinzendorf—Pity fetishes, or the psychology of sympathy—The closing of the tomb upon Jesus, the nadir of dysphoria—The similarities between psychology of love and of death—II. The meaning of the great flood toward euphoria and the stages by which the Resurrection was believed, beginning with the incredulity which regarded the reports of it as idle tales, on to the passionate and ecstatic affirmations of Pentecost—The gift of the Holy Ghost—The psychology of death and the various immortalities—Why death is hard to conceive—Immortality as a support of morality—III. Forms of belief in Resurrection—(a) The old view of restoration of a putrefying corpse—(b) the theory that it was a revival from a trance state—(c) The theory that it was due to a more subtle form of corporeity or a ghost—(d) The vision theory—(e) The psychological theory of a great resurgence from the extreme of depression, to that of exaltation—The value of dying and rising with Jesus as an immunity bath against schizophrenia—The great cults of antiquity pre- and post-Christian which centre in death and resurrection—The psychology of projection and of purification or purgation—Guilt taboo—All enemies overcome as symbols of progressive riddance of the obsession of sin and guilt which in early days oppressed the human soul—The meaning of the eucharist—What the great redemption wrought by Jesus really means in modern terms.

I.

JESUS is most widely known as the man of the cross. In hundreds of the more ignorant and backward communities of Christendom, as Mr. Fielding Hall has shown with some detail, where very little is known of his teachings, his character, or the events of his life, the crucifix is found and revered. Men, women, and children who cannot read regard it with reverence and often ascribe to it supernal properties and magical efficacy. In Catholic lands fragments of the true cross are more widely disseminated than any other

relic. In all Christian centuries the story of the cross has been the chief theme of preaching, the centre of sacred ceremonies, and the most effective propædeutic in all the repertory of mission methods among pagans. It is the deepest and most widespread of all the impressions that Christendom has made upon the human heart. In no other religion has the death of the founder had such prominence and efficacy. The natural, objective, sensuous impressions which each of the events of Passion Week was calculated to make upon the mind and heart of the observer have been wrought out with great detail in descriptive preaching, in narrative, tradition, and art. Every incident has been amplified and filled out so that the story of the last stages of Jesus' life constitutes the world's great masterpiece of pathos. It would be hard even for creative genius to add new elements to the story that could materially increase the mordant effects of this train of events, which have so burned and eaten into the very soul of believers. Many causes have lately made us negligent or forgetful of this fact. Critical studies which enlist the intellect; philosophy which neglects sensuous facts for metaphysical meanings and interprets events as symbols; perhaps, especially, theology, which has always tended to volatilize the full humanity of Jesus and thus make the Incarnation of none effect; the refinement of modern nerves that shrink from the contemplation of physical anguish; the perfervid zeal that can never wait to let his humanity have its natural effects before insisting that the man Jesus is also Very God of Very God, thus giving the biography of Jesus an inexpugnable, Docetic innervation—all these have conspired to rob the story of his death of its pristine hold upon the heart and make it seem hollow and falsetto. These influences tend to take away his Lord from the average Christian, and especially from the young, and to abate the original power of the plain story of the cross. It was the simple narrative of death and resurrection in physical terms, as first told to fresh, receptive minds, that really made the fortunes of the nascent Church.

Neither Greek tragedy nor modern history or romance can parallel the "descending incongruity" of the decline of Jesus' fortunes from the three great achievements of his soul (the triple conviction that he was the Jewish Messiah, the Son of God, and the Founder of a new Kingdom), to the anguish in his own and the utter despair in the hearts of his friends at his death and burial. The faltering, but finally

resolute, determination to go to Jerusalem, the necessity of which may have loomed up in his soul like an apparition of fate; the prospect of death thrice foretold; the entrance into Jerusalem, perhaps more ostentatiously than even his courageous heart really sanctioned; the conspiracy of the rulers; the supper at Bethany; the Passover; the treachery of Judas; the prayers in Gethsemane while thrice the disciples slept; the advent of the soldiers; the kiss of betrayal; the hearing before Caiaphas; Peter's denial thrice; Christ's muteness while he was buffeted, mocked, smitten and spat upon; his silence before Herod; Pilate's more judicial attitude of mind; the gorgeous scarlet robe and crown of thorns with the reed, ironically suggesting a kingship neither of this world nor any other; the release of Barabbas; the scourging; the invocation of his blood upon his accusers' heads; the death of Judas; the cowardly flight of every disciple; the cross-bearing with Simon; the woe of the daughters of Jerusalem; the vinegar and gall; the parting of the garments; the mocking inscriptions and taunts to come down and rule; the penitent thief; the mother, aunt, and the two Marys, alone faithful to the end, which has so often suggested a pathetic romance; the agonizing cry of being forsaken as his supreme conviction of Sonship seemed to be shaken; the earthquake, the spear, and finally the tomb, sealed and guarded—all these events copiously amplified in detail, set in scene by the most realistic imagination, every item made a theme of meditation until it stood out with an almost scarifying and sometimes actually stigmatic effect in the psychophysic organism of the believer, appeal as nothing else before or since has ever done to the sentiments of sympathy and pity, which strike to the very roots of man's gregarious nature.

It would be an interesting, although perhaps too great to be a practical, task to mosaic together the history of the effects which these events, regarded as purely historical and pragmatic, have wrought in the soul. Every station of the cross, and many apocryphal instances as well as everything told in the Gospels, have been focussed on as a special theme of meditation, a basis of exhortation as typical of larger and back-lying meaning. Believers have sought closer unity with their Saviour by reiterated, prolonged, agonizing efforts intensified by fasting, vigils, and solitude remote from the haunts of men, etc., to actually visualize the facts as if they had been eye-witnesses to it all. They have sought to put themselves in Jesus' place at every stage and

to realize how the stripes, thorns, nails, and spear would feel. Pious exercises have been developed and assigned peculiar saving efficacy, and fanatics have sought to subject themselves to some of these tortures, even the cross itself, or to make single items in this train of suffering live again in their own person. Those who have felt themselves failures, who have been deserted, or suffered from cumulative disasters and insults, or known the pangs of injustice, have brought their own experiences to bear to aid them in realizing the anguish of Jesus. Cults and sects have arisen to bring out in full relief special elements in this the world's most pathetogenetic train of events.

Perhaps only those who have made special studies in this field realize how effective every item of this galaxy of incitations to pathos still is in the young, in whom it often becomes a highly specialized pity fetish. Some illustrate this propensity of sympathy to focus by regarding the betrayal by a kiss as the acme of the tragedy. Others feel a lump in the throat or sob at the prayer, "Father, forgive them." Others have physical symptoms at the thought of the flesh torn and bruised by the scourge. And so the commendation of his mother to the care of the beloved disciple, his meeting with her on the way to Calvary, the stripping of the garments, the three falls under the cross, the Veronica handkerchief, the silence and passivity of Jesus before Herod, the scarlet robe, the awful invocation by the Jews of his blood upon themselves and their posterity—each of these and many more, may be, have been, and still are almost maddening or may bring tears, heartache, limpness, clenching of the hands, breaking of the voice, constriction in the chest, weakness of knees, involuntary groaning or sighing, or even shrieking, the haunting and persistent sense of helplessness and depression, waves of flushing or chill, and other vasomotor effects. I have collected many instances of this potent contagion of emotion which may seem to some almost incredible,[1] but the number and character of which place them beyond all doubt. A man now forty, from the age of about fifteen used to find the place exactly in the centre of the palm of his own hand where the nails went in. He was later wounded very near this spot and this experience in his quaint language, "brought him to Jesus." Others press nails against their own hands, though rarely deeply enough to bring blood, in order to realize more acutely the pangs of the cross. Many develop very exact

[1] See article on "Pity," *Am Jour. Psychol.*, July, 1900, Vol. 11, pp. 534-591.

ideas of the kind of nails. They are, for instance, tenpenny nails, blunt at the point, square, sharp, or rusty. For some the very sound of the word "nails" seems cruel and causes a nervous shudder. A few cannot help thinking upon them so intently that they have subjective sensations in the hands. A few on seeing nails that look antique feel pains in the hands from the strength of their imagination and are on the way to stigmatization. Others muse on how the nails were driven in, the heads, for instance, hammered down a little into the flesh causing needless pain, and how the last blow broke the skin as it rolled over between the hammer and the nail and spattered the blood drops that oozed out. Nervous children shudder in thinking how the first blows would "squeech and creak" before the nails would go through the flesh, or reflect on whether the larger nails that went into the feet would come out in front of the heel to help support the weight. Of all the items in my collection the nails lead in this kind of efficacy. The scourging, thorns, spear, and other tactile or haptic sensations come next. The spear, for instance, is often vividly imaged as dull or blunt, with the haft a little larger than the head, or barbed so that the pain of withdrawal was greater than that of thrust. One, in church, presses her hand against the lower rib, sometimes till it hurts, to feel more vividly the spot pierced by the spear. Some conceive it thrust with such malice that it penetrated the body and went well into the wood of the cross. In the Ober-Ammergau Passion Play the most pathetic moment is usually when the spear seems to enter the side of Jesus. A tinselled point is really pushed back by a spring into the haft causing the red ink used for blood to spurt out. I have seen this four times and inspected the apparatus, but loved to feel the sob rising and to wipe my eyes. We must reserve for publication elsewhere fuller details of this propensity of the youthful soul to sensualize the physical suffering of the Passion and to make it not merely a graphic or dramatic presentation but a personal experience. All this shows us again how nothing in any of the old dramatic unities is so calculated to bring out every strong and deep tone in all the shades and degrees of pity that can wring the heart. Were the whole story the creation of some sublime artistic genius, master in all the resources of aesthetics, or were it the slow evolution of the race soul, it would incite amazement and reverence for the faculties that could create such a masterpiece.

Pity fetishes seem to be as real as the love fetishes, now so well

recognized, but their causation is quite different. The very young cannot pity intensely because they have not had sufficient experience in suffering or in fear. Defectives are lacking in sympathy partly, at least, because they are insensitive, analgesic, and more or less disvulnerable. In general the average man pities only for pains he has felt himself or, in a secondary way, for those he fears. Thus, we come to pity in others evils which we have experienced, or to which we feel ourselves liable. It is, therefore, because we have suffered or feared in spots, as it were, that sympathy is not properly distributed but, like phobias, tends to focalization. Plato held that a good physician must have had experience with disease in his own person to know how it feels and to take his patient's point of view. Hence, the young, whose lives have been so sheltered, and the rich reared in luxury, who can so imperfectly pity the poor, cannot rightly distribute their sympathy. Hence, too, where it is felt it is prone to be over-intense. Only genius, in which the highest powers of imagination are developed, is able, with little or no experience with woe, to feel what a recent writer makes its chief characteristic—the pathos of resonance.

In a unique study, "Die Frömmigkeit des Grafen Ludwig von Zinzendorf" (Leipzig, 1910, 118 p.), O. Pfister has given us a striking analysis of religious sublimation directed chiefly toward the wounds of Jesus. As a child, Zinzendorf had no outlet for his affection, which slowly came to focus in a unique way upon the physical personality of Jesus; and so as a boy he wrote letters to Jesus which he threw out of the window at night. He prayed, was entranced, practised asceticism, but the unique fact in his whole religious career was that it was the blood and wounds of Jesus which exerted a supreme fascination for him. In the community he founded there were agapistic elements, and the most passionate affection was expressed for Jesus, the bridegroom and lover. Parts of his body and special wounds, particularly that in the side, were apostrophized in sermons, and their drawing power characterized in hymns. Believers wished to hide themselves in these wounds, and their very festering had a charm. "They lived in the wounds, were born from them, and envied the worms that dwelt in them, their home." They even developed a litany expressive of this cult that had a jargon of its own, and in scores of their hymns Christ's corpse is kissed and eaten, in an orgy of traumatolatry which was strangely bound up with their doctrine of redemption. It was

not all a Sadistic gloating over Jesus' sufferings, but there were masochistic elements in it; the wounds were erogenic zones. Indeed, the author tells us that even Luther's eucharistic ideas were somewhat nekrophagic.

Sympathy, too, begins at home with a few friends or loved ones, and irradiates to those remote in time, place, or associations slowly and, in a sense, inversely as the square of the distance. It is intensified by physical beauty, by every personal charm and grace of disposition, and every gift that provokes admiration. Perhaps, as we have seen, this element was a part of the magnetism that drew the friends of Jesus to him. Instead of emaciation and ugliness, which art has sometimes assumed for him and which the friends of Socrates doubtless magnified to bring out in stronger relief the beauties of his soul, his nature may have been at once so commanding and attractive as to give him that rare prestige which often comes from this source. Again, spring suggests life as autumn does death. With this the cults of Balder, Apollo, and many others have always been very intimately merged. The heart expands and feels far more keenly. Again, Jesus was young and cut off in the height of his promise with a work of incalculable magnitude but just begun, so that we have here the keen pathos of unrealized hope. For the old, who have lived out a fully rounded life to the end; who have finished their work; who fortify themselves by thoughts of their good deeds, perhaps now even by Weismannism, which has sources of consolation not yet utilized; who have risen to the largest ideas and in so doing are de-individualizing themselves and dying the death of Platonic philosophers in whom the great biologos has accomplished its work of involution; who have beaten the masterly retreat that can make old age glorious; who are surrounded by friends—even under these circumstances death, with its horrid accompaniments of pallor, weakness, perhaps unconsciousness; the sweat, agony, rattle, and final cessation of breath; the rigidity, coldness and decomposition, is the king of terrors for all who witness it. But for those cut off prematurely, with the gifts and possibilities of rich lives undeveloped, it is incalculably more ghastly and horrid. Again, innocence and non-resistance intensify the pathos of it. I have myself in my study of pity witnessed two hangings of criminals, both of whom had committed crimes so namelessly horrible that the indignation of communities was aroused to a high pitch. One managed to meet death

with some repose and the other struggled insanely, but here even strong men fainted or grew sick and withdrew. Resentment, for the moment at least, seemed swallowed up in pity for those suffering what has always been for man his supreme dread. But for one with no fault or crime to die with every mental and physical torture which he might have escaped, and to accept it all with equanimity, especially when his great sacrifice was for the weal of others, must have aroused in the faithful few that witnessed it emotions of a kind and intensity very rarely felt in the human soul and which art and literature are powerless adequately to describe. Justice seemed dethroned, and the resentment against even the race that caused this tragedy has ever since been deep, persistent, and widespread, blind and unreasoning as it is. All these considerations have been developed and dwelt upon in Christian cults, which have in every way sought to magnify their great natural impressiveness on the theory that every man had sin enough in his own soul to merit all this agony himself and that, by vicariously following the way of the cross as far as imagination and tender-heartedness, goaded on by every provocative, could go, the heart could be cleansed of sin, and experience a saving virtue in feeling anew all these wounds of Jesus.

In the story of the Passion, as interpreted in Christendom, Jesus is often placed in the attitude of craving sympathy. He made no sublime Promethean resistance against the will of heaven, attempted no heroics or even a Socratic apology, but bowed to the divine will, fate, or *kismet* with utter submission, with a passivity that was more feminine than masculine. He seems to many to have desired to excite compassion, and would have his followers die with him and rehearse all his litany of woe to make their self-abandonment complete. Hartmann has given us a new and deeper, if also somewhat grotesque, glorification of pity in his theory that the Absolute, before all the worlds were, was suffering intolerable pain, and that their creation was like an eruption that "ameliorated his negative eudemonism," and insists that the highest of all motives to virtue is to pity divinity, and thus to hasten on by a new motivation to morals and good works God's ultimate relief from transcendental pain and redemption.

On the other hand, familiarity always tends to blunt the effects of this sentiment. Our returns abound in expressions of regret and self-reproach that the whole story of Jesus' sufferings is now heard with in-

difference. Many think they are growing hardened, grieving the Spirit, fear they are losing belief, or backsliding, growing stagnant; find they pity saints, contemporaries, characters in romance or even suffering animals, more than they can Jesus; or perhaps think this is all because their sympathy has been overdone, forced, or premature.

Moreover, there is much in modern life to discourage pity, the pleasure field has widened so rapidly with growing civilization and comfort and immunity to want. Aristotle had what seems to us a strange dread of the overmastering power of pity, for which he thought it necessary to find in the drama or in art a method of purgation by his well-known theory of katharsis or psychic vaccination, or setting a back fire. Spinoza thought it an unworthy sentiment wherever it did not prompt action for relief. Story readers who are so inebriated by woe that it becomes an obsession, who in serials implore romancers not to let their heroes die or suffer, are, if this be true, marked with the stigmata of degeneration. Darwinism comforts us by the doctrine that, although the majority of known species and animals perish in pain, it is on the whole the best that survive. Nietzsche excoriates those who pity, and his Zarathustra denounces all who either crave or indulge in this sentiment as hysterical. For him, as for the Stoics, the sage would blush to be pitied or to pity, and he finds here a pathogenic element in Christianity and calls Jesus an amiable and neurotic degenerate.

Profoundly as we dissent from this view, this is not the place to discuss the normality of the sentiment of pity, but only its power and wide prevalence. For Christendom it was a unique moment when the body of Jesus was wrapped in clean, fine linen with Nicodemus's "mixture of myrrh and aloes about a hundred pounds' weight," placed in a new sepulchre hewn in a rock, sealed up with a stone, and guarded by a watch. As to the state of mind of the friends and disciples during these three days, and especially on the Jewish Sabbath which intervened, we know nothing whatever, for the record is an utter blank. Peter, the rock, had shown himself a vociferous, triple perjurer, and the disciples seem to have been skulking fugitives seeking their personal safety. Many must have felt their hero to be of clay, either an impostor or a foolish dreamer. That they thought this the end of him on this earth is plain; for when told that he was risen these "words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not." "As

yet they knew not of the Scripture that he must rise again from the dead." "And they, when they had heard that he was alive and been seen of her, believed not." The Jewish belief that righteousness was rewarded and evil punished here, which was so persistent in the minds of the disciples, must have wrought great disenchantment. When Rome, the hope of the world, was falling, we read that at the death of Otho the Good many slew themselves from sheer pity. The logic of pessimism or Stoicism must have made suicide the theme of every philosophic mind under those circumstances, for the last spark of hope had gone out in utter darkness. The grief, humiliation, sleeplessness, must have made this the nadir of despair for them all. Only the lust of life in youth (Keim thinks the average age of the disciples was but little over twenty) must have sustained them. What if he had lain in the grave a month, year, decade, century, and then arisen gloriously, or perhaps, when all who knew him were dead? It is, of course, impossible to conjecture what would have occurred had there been no sequel. His followers had no possible source of hope or consolation in their anguish. Everything that had begun to germinate in their souls during the years of intercourse with their master must be left to die or be actively exterminated. The powers of darkness seemed to be at the helm. The world was a "City of Dreadful Night," and with the Great Companion's shameful and miserable death a pall shrouded the earth and left his friends a prey to nameless fears. Grief at his loss, the pathos of his suffering, mortification at their own misguidance, struggled together in their souls, or perhaps left them stunned so that when they found their bearings they had to strike out a new plan of life. It might be wisest to live for the day and hour, and worship the blind power of wrong or fate on the throne of an antimoral universe. Thus, in their agony they, too, in a figurative sense, descended into hell, tasted all the spiritual torments it could inflict, and touched the profoundest depths of dysphoria. Moreover, all their personal and racial ideas and beliefs in a transcendent world of rewards and punishments lay in ruins. If there had been anything in man really worth while that could survive death, he who was so solemnly pledged to do so must come back, or, at least, give some sign of post-mortem survival. This he failed to do, and nothing remained of him but a corpse that was doomed to moulder, and the aching recollections that clutched their hearts. This life must be the be-all and death the end-all, and

every man only awaits like the brutes the inevitable hour of total engulfment in the grave. Man is a fleeting pillar of dust thrown up by a rude whirlwind. Even their bitter-sweet memories of him would soon be swallowed up in oblivion. Perhaps the thoughts of different individuals drifted in all these different ways. Some may have lapsed to resentment and indignation that their hopes and endeavours had been thus bankrupted. Such, at least, is the psychological appreciation of such an historic situation. There was no comfort from the psychic law that the healthy soul by its very nature cannot remain long in a state of extreme depression, but must react toward some more exalted state, so that the entire moral, social, religious world which was wrecked and reduced back to chaos for them, must be built up again in some form, or else they must succumb to the grim logic of miserabilism.

The psychology of death and of love agree in each having an unenvisageable fact at its core, the one a putrefying corpse, the sight of which started Buddha on his career, the other the sex act and organs. The psychalgia of the one and the shame and modesty that veil the other have used the same mechanisms, such as repression, fetishism, diversion, over-determination and sublimation, and each from its respective core has evolved a most elaborate superstructure that has played a tremendous rôle in human culture. There is a sense in which all fears and phobias are at bottom fears of death or of the arrest of the momentum of life, and there is also a sense in which gratification of every desire and wish is that of love. The one is the supreme affirmation of the will to live, the other the great negation. The real meaning of death is not understood until puberty. Just as art and religion are largely made up of sublimated sex feelings, so out of the fear of death have grown the medical sciences, hygiene, and what is far more important, the desire for and belief in immortality. Both death and the act of love transcend individuality, and neither is entirely *bewusstseinsfähig*. The "death-thought" and the "love-thought" sometimes spring up suddenly and spontaneously, and make us realize that they are the voice of the race in the individual, and that our consciousness about the matter is only an epiphenomenon. In both the genetic impulse shields the child by diverting attention from the central fact to countless irrelevancies and accessories. Just as racial instinct has striven to prevent sex precocity, so religion

strives to mitigate the old horror of the fact that we must all die and cease to be, body and soul. The Pentecostal conviction that the great incubus of ages, the greatest of all repressions, had been removed, was the culminating moment of history.

Every mode of disposing of the dead is motivated largely by the impulse to repress or divert us from thoughts of the putrefying corpse, and belief in reanimation and another life serves the same purpose. The survivors must be prevented from dwelling on the natural processes of decay, and so these diverting and defensive mechanisms have been evolved. Their worth is not all in what they give but in what they save us from, viz., obsessive thoughts of the body's decay. They are therapeutic measures against thanatophobia. The impulse to embalm, to deck out corpses, is a diversion mechanism as much as the fig-leaf, breech-cloth, or wedding-dress. Of course the four immortalities, nominal, influential, plasmal, and orthodox, have other motivations, but they sustain and support each other in ways which only this key reveals.

II

But now from this direst of extremities came the great reaction, the pivot of history for Christendom, which made the grave of the old world the cradle of a new one. Although there may have been watches and vigils, there is no recorded eye-witness of the Resurrection. The first news of the empty tomb was brought by Mary the Mother, Mary the Magdalene, who, it is often conjectured, had fallen in love with Jesus, or both of them, so that, as Renan says, the first promulgator, announcer, preacher of the Gospel of glad tidings was woman who, in this office, followed the directions of an angel with fear and trembling. The news, according to the record, was received with every indication of incredulity and skepticism as "idle tales." The sight of the vacant tomb and even the first *parousia* were unconvincing. If it was not a hallucination or a theft of the body, a dream or a fiction, conviction, at any rate, began at a faint suggestive stage and we have few details of how it passed up the long scale of probabilities till it reached a cataleptic certainty. The epochful fact, however, is that the certainty of it soon became so intense and peculiar that it needed, if it did not create, faith as a new faculty, whose chief function was to cherish it. Thus the Resurrection soon became the chief affirmation and

source of power of Christendom, the key to the right understanding of the entire apostolic and even patristic period. "If Christ be not risen our faith is vain." Many other faiths had held to a future life, but all with far fainter certainty. It was better, thought Homer, to live the life of a common man than reign in the kingdom of the dead, where all is pallid and unreal. Henceforth the belief in another life, of which the Resurrection is the object lesson and proof, became the mainspring of activity. As faith became absolute Jesus was chiefly known as the death-killer, the first fruits of them that slept, the one who had removed the sting of death and caused it to be swallowed up in victory. Although he came back weak and exhausted, it was as a conqueror. "Death-exterminator" was his chief epithet. Not only this, but he had raised others, and more yet, had gone to Hades and vanquished the ruler of death and sin. The power of the Resurrection was the chief theme of the first preaching. Christ had bearded the king of terrors and burst the bars of the tomb. Tertullian compares him to a phoenix rising from his own ashes. Thomas had actually felt the body and its wounds, and five hundred at once had seen it; and after the Ascension the abode of the dead was upward. The present world is mean, life is short and squalid, and earth made perhaps by a vicious demiurge, as the Marcion heresy later taught. Thus it was not strange that the first book of the New Testament to be written was a revelation or apocalypse of a higher world order, describing a new Jerusalem in which are all the treasures which the heart holds dear. Its architecture is elaborate and gorgeous, and slowly not only its details but those of Tartarus and purgatory grow to Dantesque vividness. This world is eclipsed by the other. It will burn, but all things worth saving are in the great Beyond. Just as Alaric destroyed Rome and the hope of the world for man as a political animal, Augustine described the City of God, and the Church inherited the forms and ambitions of the Roman State.

The world had been ruled by fear, and the greatest of all the fears is that of death. To be relieved of this and all so suddenly (for it was barely fifty days from Calvary to Pentecost), caused, as was most natural, an outburst of unbounded enthusiasm that in some temperaments amounted almost to delirium. Men chanted, raved, spoke in unknown tongues, prophesied, gazed up into heaven all day, longed for vision, with a real *parousia*-mania, straining to grasp the momen-

tous fact that death was swallowed up in victory, that its incubus and awful inhibition were removed. Every human faculty let itself go with abandon to excesses often riotous. Men babbled as if drunk with new wine, were erethic and beside themselves. There were new ideas of inspiration, and belief in possession. So widespread and intense was this tendency that it was necessary to make strenuous efforts and adopt stern measures to come back to sanity and reality and prove all spirits. The normative form of this outburst of enthusiasm was the doctrine of the Holy Ghost selectively evolved. Thus to save the nascent Church from inebriation from its great joy, it was necessary to turn attention to practical efforts; hence, preaching, proclaiming the good news, and making propaganda was the first mundane direction of the new life.[1]

The attitude toward spirits Weinel calls "the most essential possession of the innermost personal life of primitive Christendom," and shows how the ideas of the Holy Spirit developed out of the intense multifarious spiritism that long ruled. Powers of evil had made themselves felt even in the temptation of Jesus. They inspired all evil and gave doubt. Thus, behind the world were mighty, invisible, personal influences well organized, leagued, and graded, and Jesus had conquered the ministers of evil and brought the Holy Ghost which conquered hate, consoled, guided into truth, gave certainty, and could make all believers truly pneumatic as well as denizens of the higher and only real world. Glossolalia, singing, praying, poetizing, convulsions, narrating words heard in ecstasy, inspiring authorship that noted the experiences of trancelike states, sometimes even cramps, symbols, acts, all supernally motivated, were slowly subjected to a criticism which, if it limited the richness and variety of pneumatic life, slowly came to an increasingly normal direction and bestowed gifts essentially good. Pneu-

[1]On this interesting development see the admirable work of Weinel, "Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im Nachapostolischen Zeitalter bis auf Irenaus." Leipzig, 1899. Upon speaking with tongues there is already an interesting if limited literature. Godet thought it a hybrid between song and language, a kind of *récitatif*, and found it somewhat diffused among the prophets. It was developed in the cult of the Delphic Oracle of Apollo, among the Thracian orgiasts and ecstatics. Paul characterized and named it as one of the charismata. It was common among the Quakers, and Edward Irving called it the gift of the Holy Ghost. See, too, Schmiedel's "Ausführungen," II, 1, Freiburg, 1912, which is best from the philological point of view; also Lombard's "De la Glossolalie," 1910; and Mossiman's "Zungenreden," Tübingen, 1911. Especially see Pfister's study, "Die psychologische Enträtselung der relig. Glossolalie und der automatischen Kryptographie," in *Jahrb. f. Psychoanalyse u. psychopath. Forsch.*, Bd. 3, 1912, in which he censures theologians for having done so little here, which began with a young man of twenty-four who, at seventeen years, on Pentecost felt inspired to make brief utterances that no one could understand. Pfister was able to take down a large part of his very limited vocabulary and explain each word in it, showing the source and meaning of it all. His exhortations expressed his own desire to study and get religious clearness, and how he ardently wished to be a preacher and to marry a certain girl. It was a distortion of language made in order so to disguise the utterances of the most secret things of his soul that nobody could understand, and yet he could vent all that was in him. His glossolalia proved infectious and he later developed a cryptographic unknown language, and finally there came to be some liturgical stereotypy. His sister's unknown tongue played a good deal upon English, and his mother's upon Italian, but both were very infantile. Pfister thinks this the same as the xenoglossolalia that appeared among the rabbins or the phenomena of Pentecost, or that it was related to the unknown tongue in which Isaiah spoke to the Jews. See also Flournoy, "Des Indes à la planète Mars," Paris, 1900, 420 p. This gives both specimens and theories.

matophores were inspired to prophecy and virtue by spirits that came from God by baptism, laying on of hands, etc.[1]

Thus the reality of a psychic far transcending that of a sarcous body in importance was slowly established, and all mainly by the Resurrection. Faith was the organ of things unseen; virtue was other-world conduct. This life was mean and transitory. The other world had conquered this. All interests here paled in comparison with those of the next life. Thus it came to pass that at first believers in the new faith not only defied and challenged but often courted and prayed for death. They feared they were not worthy of martyrdom, and the ten persecutions from A. D. 64 to 303 gave them abundant opportunity to bear witness in the supreme way. The testimony of Tacitus, Pliny, Suetonius, and Caecilius shows that the Christians early made themselves detested as infected with a new malefic superstition aggravated by obstinacy and contumacy. They were hated not so much because they injured the business of astrologers, shrine-makers, gladiators, and the rest, as because their faith was not to them one of many, but so exclusive and supreme that they would gladly die to advance it. Thus, Jesus' followers soon came to defy, taunt, and even woo death. They gloated over the details of the charnel-house and worms. They lived in tombs, and developed the catacombs, those of Rome having hundreds of miles of passages. Tertullian said all Christians should die the death of martyrs at the end. Those who died with Christ would rise with him. Martyrdom was a prize, a great treasure, an honour, a kind of diploma *summa cum laude.* Death was despised, fled to; it was the muse that inspired to great deeds. Its worst forms were no longer hated but preferred. It was no mere thanatopsis or dreamy contemplation of euthanasia, but to achieve a glorious death was the goal which many attained of whom we know nothing else. Often men and tender women agonized as to whether they were worthy of the honour of the most horrid forms of death. Thus the newly discovered continent seemed infinitely fairer, more lasting, more charming, than the old hated world of sense, and the great enemy was met no longer with Stoic apathy but was coveted and craved. It was the essential part of man that survived, the only thing of moment, when the veil of the body was sloughed off. The soul was no longer regarded as a mere harmony, a vapour liable to be blown away if one died on a

[1] H. Gunkel: "Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes." 2nd ed., Göttingen, 1899.

windy day, but as the very man himself. Besides the mortal part there was the spiritual body which went to the home of souls. Thus the psychology of the early Christians was not without a soul. It was no mere parallelism but was instinct with futurity, and so protensive withal that agnosticism had no place. Never before nor since has the soul seemed so supremely important.

The lust for another life, or the horror of extinction, is so old and so all-pervading that it has greatly perverted man's desire to know himself. When, however, we study this lust for immortality dispassionately, we have reason to believe that the dread and pathos of it all is that man still dies so young. If we lived to an old age, not of Methusalemic or even Metschnikoffian span; and died symmetrically, not by the premature failure of some one organ or function; if thus we knew senescence as fully as we do adolescence, we should find that the lust for life would be slowly supplanted by an equally strong counter-will to die. Indeed, we might seek death actively as we now do life, and regard it as the greatest blessing. In that case there would be no immortality mania, for we should be satisfied with life here, without wanting a sequel to it, and dreams of post-mortem existence would become a nightmare. True macrobiotism means not only more years and completeness of experience but especially absence of repression. Had we lived through the whole *comédie humaine* and drunk all the drafts of bitter and sweet that were ever brewed for man, we should never want to repeat any part of such experience. The fact is, man is now cut off in his prime with most of the best things in him repressed and unrealized. He is a pathetic creature doomed to a kind of Herodian slaughter. He has felt this dimly, and so has always cried to the gods and to nature to have mercy. He has fancied answers to the heartrending appeals which he shouted into the void, and on their warrant has supplemented this life by another. When we psychoanalyze this conviction, we find that at bottom it is a sense that the human race is unfinished and that the best is yet to come. Man's future on this earth is the only real, glorious, and sufficient fulfilment of this hope in the prolonged and rich life of posterity here. The man of the future will live himself out so that nothing essentially human will be foreign to his own experience. The desire for immortality, therefore, is at bottom the best possible indication that man as he exists to-day is only the beginning of what he is to be, the pigmoid

or embryo of his true self. When he has completed and finished all that is now only begun in him, many transcendental structures will become useless. Thus doctrines of another life, whatever else they are, we may still regard as symbols or tropes in mythic terms of the true superman as he will be and the great hope that so many have lived and died in will be fulfilled, every jot and tittle of it. The deathbed visions of those who died hungering for more life will come true.

Another point of the greatest importance is that the old lust for personal immortality has now made man much more anxious to prolong and enlarge his mundane life. The great and good things he expected beyond he now strives to attain here. He wants more, not less, as of old in this life, because he expected so much in the other, so that the old belief in immortality is one of the analytic roots of hygiene and orthobiosis.

Just as sense is the organ of the physical world so faith is the inner sensory of the true soul world. It was indeed the very substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things not seen. The Holy Ghost, which was its supreme manifestation, was a new muse and organ of communication with the next world, and superior to the lower faculties of sense and reason, which were despised as filthy rags, just as the morality of this world was regarded from the standpoint of supermundane morals. Thus ideals became more real than facts; the visible Church was plastic to, and moulded by, the invisible Church. The laws of this world differed from those of the new and higher one now revealed. The two world orders collided, and what seemed miraculous here was natural there because the lower must give way to the higher. This earth was given over to evil and to destruction. Worship was the purest, other-world conduct, the avocation of heaven. No real evil could, indeed, befall a good man, living or dead, if he were good in this sense.

No wonder, therefore, that this evangel of a new impending kingdom and dispensation was heralded by a kind of hurrah preaching. The Church was the best image of heaven and suggestive of it; was the ante-room through which all must pass to arrive there. Individuality was given an intensification immeasurable, unprecedented, and of transcendent value. In this new dualism the *Jenseits* was so superior to the *Diesseits* that all the scales of value were reversed, and all the

troubles, disorders, and ruinations of the period impelled the soul to fly to and live by anticipation in its home above. Cyprian had some almost fulsome encomiums upon martyrdom which Cruttwell[1] blindly calls "a strange symptom of that unhappy age." It was really the most natural and inevitable result of a fixed and literal belief in the Resurrection and all that it implied. The passionate thirst for martyrdom made it thought by many the very best gift they could render to God, and they went far out of their way to provoke it. Men rushed to death with a cheer, which to the Romans seemed a blind fanaticism because they could not understand it to be anything but sheer obstinacy that men would refuse to cry "Lord Caesar," or burn a grain of frankincense on the altar. Tertullian praised martyrdom as a second baptism in blood with very peculiar power to wash away post-baptismal guilt otherwise very hard to remove. He even laid down what might almost be called rules of etiquette for martyrs, who must not shriek when wild beasts come upon them, etc. He exhorted men to be witnesses, thus praising those blessed ones who, crouching in gloomy prisons, awaited the martyr's crown. Even to Clement, who was a little more unsympathetic with this passion or mania, a martyr was a confessor.

Thus within the space of three days, or at most some fifty days from Calvary to Pentecost, we have a great tide from the ebb of depression to the flood of euphoria. The katabasis of humiliation, shame, and suffering was followed by the anabasis of exaltation, glory, and Resurrection. Never was there such a flood from the depths to the heights of human experience in its fluctuations between its two great poles of pleasure and pain. Even Jesus' earthly life had two sides, well illustrated by the two works of Wünsche,[2] as we have seen, in one of which he is described as suffering, solitary, misunderstood by his mother ever after his first visit to the temple, by his contemporaries and even his chosen disciples, and in the other as jubilant and triumphant. The soul is normally poised between these extremes, and when the balance is lost in either direction tends to react toward the other. The high hopes of years in the breasts of the disciples could not be permanently crushed by one series of calamities, however appalling, and any objective intimation of resurgence would be reinforced by this psychodynamic principle. Ever since Magnan's important studies in

[1] "Literary History of Early Christianity." 1893. 2 vols.
[2] See "Die Leiden des Messias." 1870. Compare it with "Der lebenfreudige Jesus." 1876.

psychiatry, alienists are increasingly prone to lay stress upon depressive or melancholiac as contrasted with exalted states of consciousness, as succeeding each other in the so-called cyclic forms of insanity, into either one of which the patient, after losing the power of reacting to the other, may settle with relative permanence. Even moods of joy and sorrow have different mental horizons and may take the form of something almost like dual personality. The healthy soul, however, is marked by the power of resilience. To explore the possibilities of human experience each way, both up and down, gives breadth, range, and, in a word, humanism. The plastic soul of adolescence is peculiarly prone to oscillate from the pain field to the pleasure field, and thereby strengthens and tempers itself, insures sanity and poise, and makes recovery from the vicissitudes of fortune a habit or diathesis. No experience of the ordinary individual sounds such extremes of misery and rapture as is presented at this epoch. To have fully realized the possibility of this great experience cadences the soul; gives it immunity against the danger of being overwhelmed by woe or enervated by joy. Having been thus seasoned, man is initiated into life and inoculated with saving heart-power against all the ills that may befall. For those with vitality to react, the greater the depression below the algedonic indifference point, the higher and the easier the ascent above it. To be helped by an external norm to this reaction gives temper to the soul, and to have suffered and rejoiced vicariously up to the full measure of its possibilities is the best initiation into life and the best safeguard against arrest at either extreme point of the pendulum. It is thus that the soul expatiates over the widest ranges of human experience. The psychologist marvels at and applauds alike the affirmative vigour that kept Jesus' disciples from being so overwhelmed at his death that they could not accept and exult in his Resurrection, and the temperance that restrained the exuberant and almost frenzied enthusiasm of Pentecost from the sibylline, mænadic madness that threatened it, formulated this exuberance into the doctrines of inspiration and the Holy Ghost, checked the impetuous zeal to bear witness by death, and diverted all this spring flood of energy to the practical work of preaching and organizing. Both ways lay danger.

Again, death is always hard to conceive of or even to accept as a fact. The personality of our friends is a very persistent force and, moreover, it is peculiarly difficult to conceive a negation. The reality

of dead friends is a persistent presence, a momentum which if we close our eyes to their vacant places will bring them back. The best explanation we have of all kinds of funeral ceremonials is that they originated at least in large part as modes of bringing home to mourners the fact that their friends were really dead and would never be seen more. Ghosts haunt relatives if they have not been properly buried, so that the last sad rites are to lay spirits by acting upon the survivors' minds so strongly that neither waking nor asleep shall they fail to realize that they are no more. Presence at a deathbed also impresses the same sad fact. The apostles were far away from the cross and the tomb. None of them knew probably by sense, but only by testimony, of their Master's death and burial, so that it is less strange if he appeared to them on the ground of his power and triumph in Galilee and amid the familiar scenes with which they were wont to associate him. They had not seen him dead or dying, and so lacked this corrective of old memories, this rectification of old associations.

Again, strong personalities, especially, die hard to their friends. They have filled so large a space in heart, head, and will, and the soul so abhors this kind of vacuum made by death that it is almost a part of the *vis medicatrix naturae* to restore the wounded psychic tissue and reinstate the loved ones again to life. Those who polarize and give new directions to lives, who sustain hope, inspire courage, open vast mental vistas, have an inextinguishable post-mortem existence for those about them, which, in these democratic days when impulse, knowledge, feeling are stirred by so many persons and are so rarely focussed upon one life, we hear little of. Hegel and Baur have both insisted that the Resurrection of Jesus consisted essentially in this kind of faith and love of the members of his immediate circle.

Moreover, love always predisposes the soul to doubt death. It is excited in almost direct proportion to the worth and perdurable reality of its object. Affection naturally chooses not the transient and ephemeral, but the abiding; and conversely when it is chosen it generates toward its object a sense of permanence and stability. Thus love conquers death.

Once more, mythopeic forces preform and predetermine the direction of psychic activities in great crises. Myth abounds in rescues of the souls of the dead from their abodes, and this general restitution motive is itself preformed by the change of seasons. As the Aryan

races penetrated the colder regions, these myths became more real, and in Balder's death and attempted rescue we have the same ground motive with many identical psychic elements and effects. Balder was the god of summer, who dies in the fall and comes back in the spring, and not only the Easter season itself but many of the popular and even Church ceremonies commemorative of Jesus' return are borrowed from pagan folklore and custom. If not in the narrative itself, still in the hold which this event has upon the heart of Christendom and in many of our reactions to it, there are abundant reverberations of psychoses that long antedate Christianity. The psychologist, too, must never forget that the human soul in its unconscious ranges, which are so much vaster than all that appears in the field of consciousness, often treasures uncomely beliefs as blindly as insects cherish their sometimes ugly larvae, dimly feeling their future racial utility. One of the marvels of Christianity is that some of its possessions, now understood and glowing with light, were so tenaciously clung to when they seem to us to have been only a mouthful of empty phrases, or senseless or absurd rites. Classical legends and ceremonials are far more comely. But the soul is far wiser and truer than it knows, and clung to what concealed worth for itself through dark ages and persecutions in a way which our philosophy is too small to explain and which should forever make us treat even superstition and the blindest and narrowest orthodoxies with sympathy and, if possible, with the hebamic art which Socrates praised.

Psychology does not pronounce on the historicity of the Resurrection as an objective fact, but it magnifies the unquestioned belief in it which became ineluctable and the chief source of power in the early Church. Of all the possible issues noted above, while Jesus lay in the tomb, only one was inevitable, and that was that the normal soul would react from despair, and if it did not find, would invent, sources of consolation. Had the evidence of the Resurrection been still less or a mere suggestion, there lies in the depths of human nature a power of affirmation that would have found some relief and might have given the body of faith to even a suggestion. The power of belief without sight or any evidence that would satisfy logical criteria was truly and wisely praised. This is not quite saying that the soul would have affirmed the Resurrection had it not occurred in fact, but it is asserting that the nature of both the individual and the folk-soul would strongly tend to

reinforce any degree of belief in that direction, would find judicial impartiality difficult, and would make every hint and hope a little more tangible or emphatic. This view at least gives added dignity to the soul, gives it some share in the great crisis of Christendom, endows it with greater powers of appreciation of what occurred, and makes historic events more cognate with its own mythopeic powers, however wide the interval between the ability to sympathize with and to create. From this point of view, some new light is shed upon the way of salvation.

Our age has forgotten the power of pathos and of fear. Comfort makes us selfish, and individualism disintegrates the old solidarity of earlier primitive communities. In becoming cosmic our sympathy is diluted and volatilized and our scholarship has failed to lay due stress upon the fact that in early days both Christians and pagans shuddered, groaned, and fainted, were convulsed and torn with an inner anguish racking the frame with intense physical symptoms as the story of the cross and all that led up to it were vividly depicted for the first time or rehearsed in solitary meditation. So, too, learning has been so occupied with the spade, with ancient codices and attempts to reproduce objective facts, that it has forgotten those that were inward and temperamental. It is increasingly hard for us to put ourselves in the place of simple minds before the dawn of science, minds capable of believing literally and with such utter abandon that Jesus had arisen, that they could cast off all fear of death, had to be restrained with difficulty from rushing precipitately into its arms with joy, and truly and practically felt as even the believer to-day does not and cannot, that the next life was infinitely vaster, more real and sure than this. But the inner history of Christianity will continue to have a great and aching void until some work of psychic reconstruction can be effected here.

The effects of the belief in the Resurrection must at once have given a new lustre to Jesus' life. Every word and incident must have been reinterpreted in the light of the new fame with which he was thus invested. It illuminated and transfigured all. Had he been a common, average man, everything about his personality would have glowed with new and hidden meanings and been invested with mystery and awe. Paul had one incalculable advantage over the disciples. His first impressions of Jesus were as one who had already arisen and even ascended, and from the apperception point of his glory he studied his

life and sayings. His own faith and teaching were conditioned upon the Resurrection, without which all would have been vain. The disciples, however, knew him in the plain, prosaic, everyday life of humanity. They had talked, walked, and eaten with him, and had been his companions by day and night. The text shows the difficulty of readjustment of their own personal experiences with him to the conceptions of the risen and glorified one. To bring unity into their minds they must tend to more or less level down the post-mortem to the ante-mortem life, while in Paul the converse process of levelling up would occur. In him, faith was all; in them, sight dominated. Briggs[1] even says, illustrating a haunting tendency of modern conservatism to make the post- and ante-mortem life intussuscept with each other, and on evidence that must forever be more or less conjectural, "We are justified, therefore, in the conclusion that we must assign no inconsiderable portion of the teaching of Jesus to his appearances after his Resurrection. It is upon the experiences of these forty days, as much as upon the year and a half of the previous ministry of Jesus, that the faith and life of the apostolic Church was grounded." We must believe it to be in the highest interests of Christianity to admit that the sequel to Jesus' life stands in some very different relation to the religious consciousness from his career before death. It appeals to psychic registers, the difference between which is somewhat symbolized by those between the ideal and the real or between the soul and the body. Supremely precious as is the former, and indispensable as it is to the soul of the Christian, it is more exalted, remote, aloof, superhuman, unincarnate, a middle term between his humanity and the *pleroma* of his fully diplomated divinity. To Paul it was all a vision, and his own legitimacy was bound up in the differences between prosaic, common, sensuous experience and the ecstatic state. Both he and the disciples were very conscious of the differences between his soul facts and experiences and their sense memories. The risen Jesus is a hovering, iridescent reality, to be regarded a little more as we ought to regard the supremest and most inspired of all creations of art, and is not exalted but in danger of being a little besmirched by too much peering criticism as to times and places, which sometimes only vulgarizes the purely ideal. This the Resurrection ever was to Paul, because it came to him as a transcendental experience, and it must ever be to us a predominantly psycholog-

[1] "New Light on the Life of Jesus." New York, 1904, 124 pp.

ical fact, truer to the nature and needs of the soul than to the canons of historical research. Humanity has never dreamed of imitating or sympathizing with its risen Jesus as it has so intensely done with the Jesus of the Passion. Tradition has done little to amplify the very scanty record between the Resurrection and the Ascension by apocrypha and myth, and it has never been a favourite theme of art. The risen Jesus did not attract even the disciples, and has always been a little uncanny, and repellent, and heartless, as if he were coldly discharging a formal theological function, or were but a mere dogma galvanized into only the pallid tenuous life of which a dogma is capable.

Thus there is a new sense in which we may now say no one is complete or has attained full moral maturity who has not passed through an experience which of old was designated as dying and rising with Jesus. The selfish ego must die and the higher social self of service must arise from its tomb. The pre-Christian mysteries knew this, and their sacredly secret rites which their initiates went through symbolized death and rebirth, and contemporary psychopathologists are well on the way to the revival of the equivalent of this cult in their therapy. It is only the next step beyond what Dejerine, Dubois, and Marcinowski have already taken to lead patients obsessed with personal anxieties to see their own worries pale by sympathetic realization that their tribulations are not the worst possible, and that beyond these there is always a great hope and resanification by retraversing with deep and sympathetic *Einfühlung* to the point of abandon the successive steps by which Jesus passed through the worst of all conceivable fates and yet found at the end the best and highest of all goals, finding in this an immunity bath, ensuring them against being upset by either extreme of pleasure or pain, evil or good, that can befall man. This is the consummate lesson of life and all who have not learned it are incomplete, inferior, arrested, not socially sane. The immemorial past, back to the old cadence of autumn and spring time, amplified and enriched by the recensions of millennia, conserves for us here its most precious heritage. The cults of many pagan deities whose shrines excavators are now unearthing were groping toward the same goal, and who knows but that we have here not only a healing formula for sin-sick souls, but even for neurotics and psychotics, so that Jesus is to be revealed in a new sense as the Great Physician to the obsessed in a way which his healing miracles only inadequately typify?

One thing, however, is certain, viz., that every degree, even the slightest, of increased faith in a future eternal life of rewards and punishments for the soul gives inestimable support to morality. It gives hedonism a wider range and makes selfishness transcendent and in some sense intensified. The sage who is supremely bent upon saving his own soul, who is assured that this life is only a portal to the next, who is not merely indifferent to wealth, fame, comfort, and a merely worldly prudence, but who regards death as only disrobing, finds it far easier to die than to swerve from his convictions of right. The Resurrection established the belief in the soul as infinitely more real than the body, not only surviving it but relieved and glorified by emancipation from it. Thus convinced, the motive of action to save life is reduced to its minimum, the supreme fear of death vanishes, and man can live out the impulsions of his inner vocation for their own sake. Of course the lust for individual survival in the next world is not the highest motive of virtue. It is a utilitarian making the best of two worlds instead of one. There is a sublime autonomous sense of oughtness in the soul that points, like a magnet to the pole, to the destiny of the human race and that differs widely from even the highest form of transcendental selfishness. This Paul glimpsed when he said that under certain conditions he might almost wish himself accursed. But by bringing immortality to light, the soul stood forth revealed, and a utilitarianism for its larger life after death was an incalculable gain, the full benefit of which, ineffably as it has advanced all good causes in the Christian world, is yet far above the level of life which the race has yet attained. It gave the greatest transvaluation of all worths and reinforced every ethical motive.

III

What is belief in the Resurrection or what does it involve and mean to psychology? The answer is, as *questionnaire* returns plainly show, that it means very different things to different believers whose lives seem equally devoted to the Master and who have long used the same formula or symbol. It is a very complex belief involving often elements that are so flagrantly contradictory the one with the other that the least examination of it brings immediate reconstruction with the mingled pain and gain so peculiar to religious progress. There are archaic but still persistent factors of this belief which popular Christi-

anity often assumes but which no disciple of Jesus, ancient or modern, no martyr, no candid professor of theology, or really religious soul ever did or can attain, and there are vulgar standards of orthodoxy so crassly material and self-contradictory that no one, I will not say with mere learning or scholarship or with only emotional or rhetorical power, but no one who has power of thought or real psychological insight or the instinct to organize his own soul coherently or logically, or who keeps an intellectual conscience, can possibly hold and be a truly honest man.

The data of our returns may be roughly grouped as follows: (a) Many think they believe in it as a literal fact because they have never candidly examined the nature of their affirmation of it. This few can do, and still fewer do. Some fear disillusion or dread the labour of reconstruction. As Albertus Magnus and Aquinas carefully reserved certain dogmas from the sphere of philosophic thought, so this psychic process is set apart as too sacred for investigation. (b) Many have some degree of faith in too crude a form of it even to be able to attain the full conviction they crave, and so are unhappy, halting and praying for more faith when they ought to reinterpret it into a form the mature modern mind demands. (c) Others think they find aid to their own faith by vociferous and dogmatic affirmation of some form of it, or find their own belief reinforced by censuring what they deem shortages or errors in the belief of others, on psychic laws akin to those which make young Mormons suspected of doubt reclaimed to faith by being sent on missions to preach their doctrines among heretics, and who by becoming advocates instead of judges convert themselves if no others. (d) Yet others with, and surprisingly often without, any knowledge of Kant's critique of the practical reason and its postulates, hold to the conventional form of belief because they think its effects on the conduct of thought, life, or both, are a higher criterion or sanction than any which reason can supply. The highest truth is that which works supremely well. (e) Many hold to it aesthetically. Art has embodied it in many forms that edify and give a true hedonic narcosis and so they have grown indifferent to historical validity. It is venerable, hallowed by association and by a consensus so wide as to be itself sublime. Moreover, poetry is often truer than fact. (f) Many think it essential for the young, and while they feel that it is outgrown in their own experience deem it vital, saving truth for children and youth, to the needs of which they subordinate not only their

own lives but their convictions, and find a pedagogic virtue in so doing that they reconcile with personal standards by often elaborate accommodation theories. (g) Finally, a few devout souls whose private lives are consecrated to the imitation of Jesus' life, and who live for good works, distinctly and consciously reject all forms of resurrection. Of these, some, chiefly women, were shocked to first realize their unbelief and are more assiduous in practising the Christian graces as if to atone for a defect, while others, more often men, have found great satisfaction in their *éclaircissement*, but believe they can do most good by conforming and working in the harness of conventionality, or perhaps think this an article of faith best left to lapse from the Christian consciousness quietly, as they believe it will do.

These are facts based, to be sure, as yet on only a few score of honest cases, most of them academic students and all of them more or less active church members who desire to lead Christian lives. More data are, of course, needed, and would no doubt show many new varieties and different statistical proportions. That they are typical of the present state of mind of thoughtful youth in the Church, who are proverbially the best material for prophecy, there can be no doubt. But few, if indeed any, held to a belief in the Resurrection that would satisfy the conventional standards of orthodoxy in the denomination to which they belonged. This shows a wide chasm between the latter and the true facts of inner religious life. To make new, fresh, close, and vital contact with the latter is, I believe, the most crying need of Christian thought to-day. A psychologist must be pardoned if he finds one chief cause of this ominous and widening chasm in the astonishing neglect to provide for any study of the soul in institutions the business of which is to train men for the work of saving it, and in the abstract, speculative and antiquated ways of teaching philosophic subjects in institutions for higher education generally. Reserving fuller exposition for later articles let us finally glance in a preliminary way at the present status of opinion on the subject.

The passages in the New Testament touching the Resurrection are, individually and collectively, extremely unsatisfactory and contain many discrepancies and contradictions. First of all there were, as every one knows, as mentioned above, no recorded eye-witnesses of the process itself, as there were in the case of Lazarus. We have no account of how it occurred. The guards slept, the disciples fled even

before the crucifixion, and the proofs which appear chronologically first differ in details, such as whether the angel sat, stood, was inside or outside the tomb, etc. The number of *parousias*, the persons to whom, and the places in which, he appeared, have always been difficult to harmonize. The quasi-materiality of the risen body, the unforetold and unexpected event of his bodily presence, the tardiness of recognition—all show us that we are now in a very different position with regard to historic reality from that afforded us by the record of the public ministry. Everything is hazy, falsetto, and at every point profoundly different from the kind of evidence that modern coroners or medical boards might furnish. For this reason alone, belief in the Resurrection must forever remain a matter of faith or subjective conviction, and involve more or less of a *salto mortale* for the modern and especially for the scientific mind. In view of the stupendous nature of the fact assumed it must always remain more or less incredible, and for every one who accepts it there will forever be a real, though perhaps unconscious, handicap on the energy of conviction. That the disciples and immediate friends of Jesus were convinced that they had seen his resurrected personality in some form, and that this was a source of great reassurance and one of the chief bases of their preaching, and gave it its chief momentum, there can be no doubt. It is, however, now quite competent to inquire upon what evidence this belief rested.

(a) Elemental as are the considerations involved, it will remove a great burden and reproach from modern Christian belief for us to recognize fully and honestly at the outset that the Resurrection cannot mean for us to-day the reversal of the processes of physical death. It is a suicidal materialization of religious faith to hold to all that this implies. Death means, according to various legal and physiological tests and criteria, the cessation of respiration and therefore of oxygenation of the blood, and the complete arrest of the action of the heart. The nervous system, it is now believed, dies first, the cerebral preceding the sympathetic. Soon the glands and other tissues follow in an order determined by the nature of the morbific or lethal process. Products of decomposition accumulate; the blood coagulates in from half an hour to twelve hours, depending upon the degree of exhaustion; the muscle plasm hardens to cadaveric rigidity; and with the gradual relaxation of *rigor mortis* putrefaction sets in. Before the cooling of the body begins very subtle changes occur in its protoplasm, which is changed

from an active state with many elements of its composition unknown to a dead state, the constitution of which is now pretty well made out. Recent neurological studies indicate momentous changes in the brain neurons. Reanimation of a grave corpse after three days would mean inversion of all this sequence of processes after they had advanced so far that death by every criterion must be pronounced complete. Modern definitions and conceptions of death make the idea of revivification indefinitely harder than it was before the development of modern physiology, especially its chemical section. Moreover, the modern mind must ask what was the condition of the wounds, whether they had cicatrized, whether the spilled blood had been restored or there was still extreme anaemia. Was the weight the same? From the record it appears that the risen body was no longer without spot or blemish, but was at least scarred. It is no pedantic intrusion, but an irresistible query of every judicial and especially scientific mind, to dwell upon the many details of this order, which are here suggested.

It is no revival of the Humean argument to urge that from the nature of both testimony and of miracle such a one can never be really proven, that the belief in any such series of reversals of the order of nature must forever and by every mind, no matter how devout or impassioned the instinct of its belief, remain more or less superficially forced or formal. Fervid affirmation of such a faith is an act of will rather than of deliberate, deep, and poised intellectual conviction. Its satisfaction and even sublimity is psychologically akin to the *credo quia absurdum* by which practical faith sometimes loves to stop the mouth of reason. Plato's imagination was creative and vivid enough to describe the reversal of the processes in nature's cycle when the universe turned about with a shock and revolved the other way, when old men rose out of the dust, gradually grew young, and entered again their mother's wombs; but Pliny's philosophy made it a matter of consolation to mourning friends that even the gods could never raise the dead. That faith in the Resurrection has often taken this monstrous form in crass and literal minds there can be no doubt, but a large view of all the Pauline passages indicates that the sense in which he made the Christian faith vain if Christ be not raised is not this. Such a fact, so unique and out of relation with everything we know, must forever be no less antagonistic to the higher activities of faith than it is stultifying to science and common sense. Even if it has ever

had any value, this has ceased to exist for modern culture, and it is not only no longer needed but is a grievous encumbrance to modern apologetics. An intelligent man who affirms that he holds this belief can hardly know what *intellectual* honesty means.

(b) Another view not unknown in earlier times, and also favoured by several of the most careful and conscientious modern Christologists, is that Jesus was not entirely dead, but was revived from some form of trance. Paulus suggested that the sponge applied to his lips may have contained a narcotic, and intimates that when he bowed his head upon the cross he fainted. Jung inclined to the same view. Schleiermacher favoured the hypothesis of apparent death. Brehmke and others (see Chapter 2) thought he revived, and lived and worked for a quarter of a century later in obscurity. Pilate seemed astonished that he died so soon. Hengst imagines that he may have revived and prayed among the hills, where he led perhaps a kind of prolonged Mahatma life. His own rare healing powers, it has been said, may have been exercised upon himself. He was vigorous, endowed with rare vitality, and in the prime of life, so that he naturally would not succumb easily to death. Moreover, the body was perfumed, perhaps bandaged and possibly embalmed, and treated according to the surgical arts of his day, else why the hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes in John xix: 39? One tradition reports that his feet were not nailed, that the spear wound was low in the thigh, and therefore not necessarily fatal. Medical records, to say nothing of the traditions of Catholic saints, report cases of actual crucifixion, where both hands and feet were pierced, from which recovery has been made. Modern resuscitative methods, particularly in the case of drowning, and the records of the gallows, present authentic cases where life has thus been snatched from the very jaws of death in rare ways. The purity and sinlessness of his life, it has been said, gave augmented vitality, and perhaps the earthquake shocked him back to life. (See Chapter 2, Sadin.)

The history of human hibernation is a strange chapter, but the reality of its main facts may be said to be proven. Respiration and heart action can be almost incredibly reduced beyond the reach of the usual methods of detection, and subjects can be actually buried and aroused again after days and perhaps weeks of a high degree of suspended animation. In these cases the processes of dissolution, of course, do not supervene and there is no death, one factor in the very

conception of which is the impossibility of restoration to life. Those familiar with the strange facts of modern hypnotism, which are accepted by the most conservative psychologists, know how far death is sometimes thus simulated by its brother sleep. Even the uncontrolled sporadic cases, where hysterical subjects have in imagination passed into and long remained in unconscious and perhaps cataleptic states, must be weighed if this view is to be seriously dealt with. The soul in this state may in vision have visited the abode of the dead and returned with strange and vivid dream pictures. All these phenomena are now more or less understood.

If this be the hypothesis we could partially explain the changed appearance of Jesus after this exhausting experience. We should expect him to be feeble, anaemic, pallid, hungered, a trifle dazed and mysterious to himself and others, instinctively seeking seclusion and rest for restoration. He would naturally, exhausting though the effort might be, endeavour to see his friends again, so that he must lapse back again to death indeed. To intimate, as has been done, that death was simulated in order to be escaped is an extreme hypothesis which has little positive evidence to countenance it. It would, however, only be conformable to the promptings of the instinct of love to appear as well and strong as one's condition allowed in the presence of one's friends.

If any such hypothesis as this be accepted, it must not be forgotten that it is not resurrection in the sense which the Church held of old. It would remain an illustration of marvellous vitality, but the superstitions of death have always been such that those who were believed thus to break away from its close embrace have always been objects of wondering awe and curiosity rather more than of love, devotion, and service. Such an event must be regarded as more or less accidental, as suggesting at best a being endowed with supernormal viability, able to resist causes of death which would effectively overwhelm most men. It would not add any sanction of divine authority, would give no warrant of a general and real resurrection of others, but would distinctly rob the death on the cross of much of its impressiveness and power. It would be no real confirmation of any interpretation of his own prophetic intimations, and could not be a factor in the rôle of the Jewish Messiah. While this view, therefore, is not impossible and can never be absolutely disproven or proven, it has against it an enormous improbability, and has little power of edification.

(c) From the early times of Celsus down to Weisse and even Keim, many have held the *parousia* to be of some higher and more subtle form of corporeity. Each of the Christophanies is held to imply some degree of materialization. There was a real presence as the objective cause and at the *point de repère* of the vision. From the standpoint of this theory, which Venturini has elaborately exploited, the physical body is not needed and the grave might have remained either tenanted or empty. It is a heavenly or glorified body or form of objectivity, a soul disembodied "stooping to visibility," or in plain terms a ghost or spectre. This theory is not without consonance with some facts of the record like the passing through closed doors, the sudden appearance and vanishing, the appearances now in Jerusalem, now in Galilee, the difficulty of recognition, etc.; but it hardly comports with eating, touching, speaking, as Jesus did. To many this view may have a certain new interest from the recent studies of apparitions which have convinced many cultivated minds that there may be phantasms of the living or dead, which are invested with some form or degree of objectivity and are not wholly subject to the laws of matter. This view has been developed, especially in England, by a group of bold spirits in the Society for Psychical Research, whose views are far more definite than those of Seydel, Scholten, or Ewald, who also held it. They have made a future life seem more real and true to minds that claim no so-called "mediumistic" power, or indeed any supernormal faculty. A laborious colligation of hundreds of dreams by Mr. Gurney has erected what is thought to be a formidable presupposition in favour of a continuance of individual existence, at least in an attenuated form. We have been exhorted by Mr. Myers, the coryphaeus of this school, to have more resolute credulity toward the accumulated and systematically presented new evidence of a physical basis of immortality. Mr. Robert Dale Owen long ago described the "feel" of ghost clothes, which melted away in his grasp. We find, too, a few cases of sensations of spirit breath upon the cheek. Appeal is also made to a supernormal faculty of receiving personality suggestions, to some kind of rare sensitiveness which Mr. Podmore says must be either a vestige of some function of primordial organisms or else a bud of powers later to be unfolded. This faculty, we are told, may in some way, difficult to characterize because of the absence of mundane analogies, become exalted to a hallucinatory state, which, however, has a veridical and

objective cause. This latter is not a common ghost or an astral body, and indeed no physical process at present known can adequately explain its mode of action. Yet in some way the faltering soul of man may be thus brought into *rapport* with forms of individual existence which have survived death, in a way which gives faith in a future life by actual communication with departed acquaintances, and which affords some kind of answer to the long and agonizing cry of the soul—"If a man die shall he live again?" If the future life has a high degree of reality and those dead retain any reminiscence of earthly experience, the presumption that they may find some mode of revealing their continued existence weights every die, and where the air is murky with superstition and there are fabulists and those who strive and hunger for this evidence, it seems strange that at the very least in a few unique cases this passion should not be gratified. The fact that this theory seems to modern science stupendous and revolutionary, that it is hardly susceptible of physical expression but must be wrought out in poetic metaphors and has never attained anything like true demonstration, though those who have struggled to make it apprehensible use the theories of ether, neuricity, and eccentric projection toward some kind of objective correspondence, even the wild intemperance of spiritualists of every age and clime, should not blind us to the possibility of some such truth in a world as yet but imperfectly realized, in which science is still in its infancy and man himself only in an active developmental stage. For those whose minds are not encumbered by critical methods some such hypothesis can readily be developed which affords a satisfaction very great and tranquillizing, and for them it is indefinitely easier to explain the whole class of phenomena by it than to enter tediously upon the indirect long-circuit methods of critical testing and historic research which are now demanded in this field.

On the other hand, there are some things which it is a virtue to doubt. Superstition has no ranker, grosser forms than those due to the attempts long ago described by Kant to explain the dreams of visionaries by those of metaphysicians. While it is impossible to enforce temperance of thought upon this subject in the popular religious mind, and while it would be the labours of Hercules over again to drive out from their cover in the many and vast fields of hypotheses opened by modern science all the traces and forms of these survivals, it is nevertheless necessary to say in unequivocal terms that the probabilities

against a single isolated occurrence of this nature seem to the natural mind almost overwhelming. It is not at all impossible, from the fear ascribed to those who saw the risen Jesus and from the characteristics implied in these Christophanies, that some of the cited witnesses honestly believed that they saw his ghost. Indeed, when we consider the frequency of such experiences, especially in the cases of great and beloved leaders, and the almost universal prevalence of a belief in spectres as objectively real, brought out in so admirable and scholarly a manner by H. Weĭnel, it is highly probable that this was one of the important factors in the great and sudden change from extreme depression to extreme joy and confidence. Yet still more we must incline to the view that this interpretation of real experiences is more plausible for earlier appearances than the theory of subjective, even if revelatory, vision. To the belief that the ghost of Jesus had actually reappeared Christianity probably owes no small part of its initial momentum. A credited apparition may have had something to do in giving to the early Christians, and through them to the world, their God. But even if we hold them to have been in error in this regard, we must hasten to say somewhat as Fairbairn said of the vision theory, that at least it worked supremely well. Men may have once believed on superstitious grounds on him, whom now the world is coming to adore as divine in a higher sense than the early Christians could comprehend. We have here only an extreme illustration of the fact that from age to age the basis and emphasis of belief in Jesus have changed, but that he has always occupied in the souls of his disciples the highest place which every stage of culture could provide. That even superstition was thus made to praise him is no derogation of his merit, no stigma upon his character, and should cause no abatement of our own trust in him. It was not only necessary but inevitable that he should impress those about him with a sense of a reality and validity in his own teachings, sentiments, and character that far transcended their narrow comprehension. One form which the conceptions of great men then took was that of the superiority, actuality, persistence, and power of survival generally of their souls. The ideal thus became real, the transcendent immanent. The plastic, receptive power of mind, sense, and feeling passed over into the passionate enthusiasm of will. The very energy of being which to-day makes a popular hero, a leader, and compeller of souls, was then wont to be appreciated and interpreted as control of

the powers beyond the grave. History cannot be written without recognizing at some of the most important crises in human events the power of belief in even the veridical nature of dreams.

While, therefore, for us the spectre theory has little of the power which Paul ascribes to the Resurrection, it was by no means devoid of it in ancient days. It is also well to reflect that for those who still hold any form of the hypothesis of spiritualism, credence in the Resurrection of Jesus is an easy matter, for it becomes only a highly specialized and perhaps uniquely preëminent case under a general law. Just as the same natural phenomena are interpreted according to radically different theories in different ages, so we have here an illustration of the progressive reconstruction of the apperception organs in man.

(d) Far more current now is the vision theory, represented in different forms by Spinoza, Strauss, Renan, Seydel, Raville, Fichte, Geiger, Noack, Gratz, and others. For some the Resurrection is a specially inspired vision sent by God. Some, like Fichte, distinguish between visions that can and that cannot be explained; or attempt psychological distinctions between imagination, abnormal ecstasy, and faith; hint at the possibility of dreaming either by night or by day; distinguish between visions self-generated or due to the contagion of numbers; between visions vivid enough to cause complete belief in their objective validity and those that bring only partial conviction. They expatiate on Paul's diathesis and Peter's ecstatic experience, or discuss the extent to which the visionary practices which Noack suggests even Jesus cultivated, and which the Montanists afterward unfolded, prevailed in the apostolic circle before and after Jesus' death. Renan calls Mary a visionary, and intimates that in her person a woman became the first missionary. There is much consensus of opinion that Paul saw visions; and if he did not rest his claims to the apostolate upon them, nevertheless he regarded them as in some sense a commission directly from Jesus to preach the Gospel.

The discrepancy among different writers in their conception of the psychology of vision and the imparity between the different Christophanies for Paul himself, and between his and those of others, has its root, perhaps, in the wide variety of experiences which the term vision is used to include. For those who are visually minded, a clear belief

readily takes the form of an image with contours and even colours. In many perfectly sane persons there are entoptic experiences of visualization that may be so entirely independent of the stream of thought as to seem objective, while in other cases they give a concreteness to the processes of ideation, almost as vivid as pictorial illustration. Life at twilight and during the night is very different from that of the clear day in this respect. In darkness thoughts create and project objects that often attain a high degree of objective clearness. Fechner has well characterized the influence of the night side of life upon human conduct, and modern psychology abounds in cases where illusions and dream experiences have become definitely incorporated into the memory continuum as actually experienced.

Moreover, intense experiences involving great emotional stress always tend to shift the boundaries between the inner and the outer. The sensorium may be anaemic or congested, and the perturbation of the souls of the disciples in those days has not inaptly been compared to the resolution of the world back to some primitive cosmic state from which it slowly cooled again. Even more frequent than visual is auditory hallucination, and both may be entirely consonant with mental sanity and normality in other respects. Seeing visions has in many persons and in many ages been a passion and evolved a very definite cult. Many theories of inspiration have had recourse to vision theories. In primitive ages there is no such distinction between illusion and perception as we often find in the early stages of neuro-psychic disease. Yet the old proverb that seeing is believing has a deep psychological truth. Helmholtz has well said that any illusion of sense persistently repeated is certain in the end to force itself upon the acceptance of the mind with full and inexpugnable conviction. To have actually seen the risen Jesus made belief in his power over death and all that it implied irresistible, and when reinforced by all the hopes, desires, and love of his friends would give this faith a momentum not inferior to the supreme cataleptic certainty of the Stoics and would give their preaching the impetus of tons instead of pounds.

Mary's enthusiastic annunciation of the Resurrection must have been the gladdest of all Gospel good tidings. It was news that must be spread. Tongues grew aflame like Jove's chariot wheels under the impulse to spread the greatest and best news ever proclaimed. It was simply tidings of a momentous and unique message from the future

home of all men, far higher and farther above all news-mongering than preaching is above gossip. Paul underwent a radical reconstruction of standpoint and life-purpose under its influence, and the supreme duty of all who had been clairvoyant and clairaudient to the great *parousia* was to promulgate the great fact, to proclaim it from the housetop, to organize a world propaganda of it. The Resurrection was the central event in all the universe, to which every important preceding event led up, in which it focussed, and from which all agencies for good in the world must henceforth irradiate. The man Jesus became the Divine Christ. All his teachings obtained a sanction direct from God. The Resurrection was not only the great attest and credential, authorizing all his words and giving the most sublime possible climax to the tragedy of his life, but it marked a new era in the relations of this world to the Supreme Author of all being. Thus I opine it did not need, as Keim holds, any definite closing of the period of vision or any authorization to cease gazing into heaven, to recover self-possession, and go to work. There was a spontaneous and inevitable passage from a state of convincing vision and passionate belief to enthusiastic will, a great psychosis under the influence of an unprecedented train of experiences and in an age dominated by psychic forces, which never and nowhere else, before or since, was aroused in any such kind and degree. The disciples, at least the dominant members of their group, had seen. That was enough to henceforth make them all missionaries, preaching that which had been actually seen and heard.

In fact, Paul's conception of Christ had very little to do with the earthly life of Jesus. So far as modern Christianity is Pauline, it is essentially unhistoric so far as both the words and the deeds of Jesus are concerned, and indeed, has little connection with the Jesus of the synoptic writers or even with the Johannin Jesus. Paul's mind was chiefly fixed upon the voluntary humiliation of the preëxistent Jesus in coming down to earth, taking on the form of man and submitting to crucifixion. By this supreme act of renunciation, obedience, and love he merited and received the reward of Resurrection and Ascension and still greater exaltation at the Father's right hand than he had before. His daily life, walk, and example constituted an otherwise relatively insignificant episode in the transcendent being of a preëxistent and still more lofty post-existent state. Paul praises in many and diverse paradoxes the virtue of his self-emptying of celestial glory and taking

on the humiliation of flesh. In this sacrifice and self-offering his consenting to death was involved.[1]

(e) Perhaps the world has mistaken a group of psychological experiences, profound and of supreme historic significance, for plain, bald historic fact, but the mistake is of far less practical significance either way than has been thought. Textual criticism, laborious compilation of contemporaneous allusions, the possible discovery of new manuscripts or archaeological inscriptions, can never make the apologists of the historical school the chief authorities for the post-mortem appearances of Jesus, and their verdicts will always remain of limited effect upon the souls of believers. But if we insist that this is all at bottom psychology, we must also candidly admit that we are here in the presence of soul-events which have features that it is hard to parallel in all the records of the individual or the collective mind. Psychology with its special sections on illusions of perception, on the life of feeling and will, on the individual and the movements of groups and races of men, has yet much to learn and is still in its infancy, but it is already big with the promise and potency of larger and more cogent explanations here, which far from weakening faith will give it both a higher sanction and a larger scope with strict conformity to science.

How much of it all was due to vision and how much to other factors, whether some disciples dreamed while others thought of ghosts, especially how many parts of objective reality different individuals ascribed to their experiences, and just how Paul himself understood his own, we can never with certainty know. New books and theories in indefinite perspective will continue to trim the Christian ship by rolling the weight of one or all of these four ballast boxes to starboard or larboard, but if anywhere the frank confession of *ignoramus*, if not of *ignorabimus* is proper, it is here.

While, then, some forms of belief in the Resurrection must be definitely abandoned as obstacles to faith, others, not one but several,

[1]See "Die Entstehung der Paulinschen Christologie," by Dr. M. Brückner, Strassburg, 1903, 237 pp., which expresses essentially the thought of the above paragraph and urges that Paul had from his youth a very definite idea of a supernatural Jewish Messiah, and that his conversion consisted chiefly in the visual apparition of his ideal in a form so like the Resurrection Jesus that the two concepts were instantly fused. At the same time his ideal was supplemented and enlarged by the kenotic idea of the episode of Incarnation and higher post-ascensional glory. Thus the risen and ascended Jesus of Christendom is the highest idealization of the Jewish Messiah of Paul's time, which included conflict with, and victory over, demons and all the supernal powers of evil, but now universalized and freed from Mosaic laws and Jewish limitations and given cosmic significance. Brückner does not state, but very clearly leaves us to infer, that had Paul known the historic Jesus it is doubtful if this identification with his earlier Messianic ideal would ever have occurred. Thus Paul sought to convert gentiles to the most exalted of Jewish ideals, but the nature and work, which was essentially transcendental and connected with the historic Jesus only by a vision of identification, was later confirmed by Jewish metaphysical speculation. This noble ideal not only became an apparition, but took the form of flesh and died to provide a Jewish atonement for Jewish law. This identification is the chief masterpiece of religious genius in the world, and has in many if not most respects worked supremely well, although there is as little intussusception between the historic Jesus and the racial ideal as between the parts of the Image of Ezekiel's vision.

far higher are not only possible but inevitable for every large and positive mind, instructed in the nature of the individual and racial soul. They neither can nor should yet be formulated with definiteness or finality enough to satisfy those who demand rigid dogma or apodeictic demonstration. The character and teaching of Jesus have a supreme and independent value of their own, and his death will ever work its miracles of pathos. These, at least, will remain historic even if the Resurrection be all dogma. If all the precious worths that have been made in the course of Christian centuries to depend upon the cruder statements of the latter as an assumed major premise for innumerable deductions be a little imperilled for a time, psychology has within itself possibilities hitherto undreamed, of both restatement of the premise and revalidification of all the values and of thus re-Christianizing Christianity.

While the Jesus of what we may call the Resurrection dispensation is undergoing reconstruction, the historic Jesus remains as, at least, the true superman, prophetic of what the members of our race may attain if it ever come to its full maturity, the first fruits not of those that die, but the first and ideal representation of those who are to live in the larger and more glorious future that, if evolution is true, awaits it. If the Resurrection Jesus is made so material and historic as to eclipse the spiritual Jesus, if he is made so local and temporal as to be a mere idol of the ever-living and ever-present Emmanuel, there is religious decadence and not progress. If he whom Paul saw as a vision the psychologist of the near future shall find to be more a creation than a mere object of faith, most sacred because the first, highest, and purest production of the Paraclete in the soul of man; if the risen Jesus was projected by this supreme muse solely to be, as well as to make, the pledge of its abiding presence guiding into all truth, then he would be revealed to our distracted age as the Comforter indeed. For then not only the growing strain which the *parousia* put upon the Christian thought of our day would be wondrously eased and harmony in the record established, but the work of the Holy Spirit would be worthily inaugurated in the world as the great spiritualizer of life, and the Jesus of the Resurrection as completely and entirely its first fruits would shine forth with a new light and with infinite promise and potency for all who strive to attain true sonship with the Father.

This imperfect and sketchy conflation of psychological viewpoints

at least suggests something above textual or historical criticism and shows that these cannot be finalities. The latter have clearly shown that even the authors of our four Gospels, especially the unknown writer of John, conflated and compiled and reverently sought to explain in the light of all the available sources, traditional and written, what Jesus meant quite as much if not more than what he literally said and did. Psychological criticism accepts all the records, somewhat as geology bases upon all outcrops, cuts, mines, etc., and evolves from a compilation of all data the sequence of strata and the development of living forms by collating all the fossils with their most cognate living forms. So psychology demands a wider purview than the New Testament and the local and temporal events associated with it, and seeks to lay the foundations of a larger faith that shall rest on all that we know to-day of the facts and laws of nature and still more of the soul of man.

The Passion and Resurrection must to-day be discussed in view of a vaster background than the Old Testament affords, for they are the culminating redaction of the central theme of many cults far older than they, all about the eastern Mediterranean, each of which contributed its best elements. How the folk-soul came to make this most imposing and precious synthesis is at once the most stimulating and lofty of all culture problems, and the new vistas that we can already glimpse give us the vastest and most imposing perspective into the past of man's psychic evolution. Most superstitions were found in Rome before Christianity, which, unable to suppress them, purged them of their grosser features and syncretized them. In several localities in Italy, and best of all in Sicily, Easter is still very dramatically celebrated on the older pattern of Adonis worship. For instance, a wax effigy of the dead Christ is exposed all through Good Friday in the middle of a Greek church, and is covered with fervent kisses, while the church echoes with dirges. At nightfall it is carried, covered with flowers, in slow, solemn procession through the crowded streets. Every man carries a taper and wails, while women from every house fumigate the image with censers. Thus the community celebrates the funeral of Christ as if he were just dead, and all fast till midnight Saturday. As this hour strikes the bishop appears and announces that Christ has risen, and the crowd responds, "He is risen indeed." Then the church and soon the city burst into an uproar of joy with mad shouts and shrieks. There are volleys of cannon and musketry and fireworks,

and the erstwhile fasters fill themselves with meat and wine. Thus Catholicism brings before the susceptible Southern races with all possible pomp and pageantry the representation of the death and Resurrection of man's redeemer from sin by the very rites once used to redeem the earth from the death of winter. Both the spade and psychoanalysis of the folk-soul are now unearthing old, submerged symbolic strata which show us that Adonis, Attis, and Osiris, though dead in name, still live wherever Christianity lives. This ethnic background so long fallow still fertilizes and enriches our own lives, and enables us to understand why Christianity spread so rapidly among the gentiles. We can even correlate these phenomena with the predominance of suicides in the fall and revivals and procreations in the spring.

Ever since the glacial age the soul of man has been impressed with the processional of the seasons. In the spring the world is clothed in green, everything reawakens or grows, food is abundant, and the spirit of life is resurrected from the death of winter. Conversely in autumn vegetation dies, the sun recedes, there are cold and ice, the conditions of life grow hard, and nature seems dying. Primitive man must have been awed by these cosmic tides and, especially with his close *rapport* with nature, must have watched for the ebb of the thermal wave. Thus it is not strange that in monuments, myths, mythologies, rites, we are rapidly finding everywhere more and more traces of these changes and of the magic by which man of old sought to control them. Scholarship in this field is exhuming more and more the vestiges of these cults. Man early felt that this birth and death of nature were connected with the waxing and waning figures of divine beings who controlled them, and that their energy might be increased by dramatic representations of the processes he wished to facilitate. The universal theme of these dramas was thus death and rebirth, at first chiefly the latter in the field of vegetation. Control came from symbolizing it, and vegetation is often presentified as a god who annually died and arose. Of this theme there are endless local variations, beginning with Adonis, the Asiatic Tammuz, the Old Testament Adoni, My Lord. Following Frazer, in ancient Babylon he was the young spouse of Ishtar, the great mother-goddess of reproduction. Every year he died and went to the sad, dark regions below, where his divine mistress followed him. During her absence love died, reproduction ceased, and life threatened to go out. Hymns lamented

the departure of the pair, liturgies were chanted to the effigy of the dead god, which was washed in water, anointed with oil, clothed in red, fumigated with incense designed to effect his resurrection. Finally the great god Ea himself sent a messenger to the grim queen of the inferno, who at last very reluctantly sprinkled the waters of life upon the pair, and they were allowed to return, and then all nature revived with springtide energy. In Greece Adonis was a transcendent beauty, beloved by Aphrodite, who in his infancy gave him to Persephone, queen of Hades. She, seeing his beauty, refused to give him back. So Zeus decreed that he should spend half of the year with the one goddess below and the other half in the upper world. When he was slain Aphrodite bemoaned him as if anticipating the *mater dolorosa*. Of this species of celebration we have many sub-varieties. In Phoenicia these rites were very solemn and the kings of Biblus assumed the god's name, as was done in very ancient times in Jerusalem. David himself showed vestiges of this cult by being held more or less responsible for drouth, famine, and certain diseases. Earth was the great mother of plants and animals, to whom first-fruits were offered and sons and daughters devoted, so that trees, crops, and beasts were all children of Baal and Astarte. Once a temple of Adonis stood on Mount Lebanon, amid one of the most impressive of all landscapes, where the whole region has long been haunted by traditions of the mangled body of Adonis here buried. Here he was worshipped by Assyrian damsels when the river was incarnadine, and the sea fringed with anemones, which dyed them with the blood of the god untimely slain. At Cypress the cult degenerated to sanctified harlotry, once, Frazer says, thought to be as much a religious duty as is now the nun's vow of virginity. Here the worship was a symbol of fertility, and the variations of this cult and the anonymity of such unions caused the offspring often to be called children of God. Sometimes, as at the temple of Epidaurus, souls of the dead were reincarnated, while ploughing and sowing the earth are given the same significance. Widespread was the ceremony of burning Melcarth, centred in Tyre. In Sophocles' drama, Hercules burned himself on a vast pyre on the top of Mount Œta; this was afterward annually repeated with his effigy, and the next day came the drama of the awakening of Hercules. Still farther back the kings of Tyre personated Melcarth and were burned in effigy at an annual festival, later toned down to a fire-walk. So the Punic general,

Hamilcar, burned himself in the old heroic way *pro bono publico* as he saw his army giving way, for this was the old method of apotheosis. The burning of the Sicilian Sandan was followed by a ceremony of resurrection. Among the Semites under this or other names Adonis was often personified by priestly kings, perhaps originally put to death in their divine capacity, although later there are mitigating stages and makebelieves. In Alexandria images of Aphrodite and Adonis celebrated their nuptials on two couches with manifold flowers and fruits. The next day their death was bemoaned with streaming hair and bare breasts, and their images were burned by the sea; but they always returned in another ceremony in the spring. Even when the Emperor Julian entered Antioch, this great capital was splendid with grief for the mimic death of the annual Adonis. With the rise of agriculture, the Adonis cult centred upon domesticated plants and animals, but still the fear of hunger animated the entire vast cycle of Adonis worship all the way from the first edible wild fruits to the day of corn, spirits, and herdsmen. Sometimes the dead were feigned to revive with life in the spring. At Athens they were commemorated in March with the earliest flowers, when they were thought to rise from their tombs and go about everywhere seeking entrance, for the festivals of the dead are always those of flowers. Sometimes potted grains and flowers were fostered in every way to accelerate their growth, to make all herbs grow by homoeopathic magic, and these were called gardens of Adonis. Personifiers of this revival were always bathed or washed in water or blood to ensure against drouth.

So, too, Attis was of virgin birth, lover of Cybele, mother of gods and goddess of fertility, and his cult was celebrated by eunuch priests who commemorated his tragic death and resurrection. In 204 B. C., Cybele and her cult were brought from Phrygia to Rome and solemnly inaugurated on the Palatine Hill in April. The next year the crops were abundant, so that henceforth this festival took a very strong hold upon the Romans. Before the effigy of Attis's corpse the priest shed some of his own blood with barbaric music and frenzied dances. The image of Attis was taken from the sacred tree to which it was swathed, and reverently buried, and there were mourning and fasting. But suddenly at night a light was struck, the tomb opened, and the god was found to have arisen. The priest touched the lips of the mourners with balm and whispered in their ears the glad tidings of salvation.

His resurrection was a promise to his disciples that they should rise from the grave. The next day the resurrection of the god was celebrated with carnival, license, masquerades. The following day was for repose, and the next and last was marked by processions of barefoot nobles to the banks of the Arno, where the image was bathed and the wounds and blood were forgotten. A bull was butchered on a high grating, and the devotees with wreathed fillets stood below to be drenched in the hot blood, and thus sins were washed away. The fiction of a new birth, too, was kept up for a time by requiring of the initiate a diet of milk like a babe. For a long time thus the remission of sins by the blood of a bull was dramatically represented on the Vatican Hill, on the very spot where now stands the Basilica of Saint Peter. Attis was originally a tree spirit, then a corn and grain god, tied to or burned on a Maypole, which stood for a holy tree. Castration and the burial or burning of various parts were to impregnate the earth, and the same is true of all kinds of bloodletting in religious service. Slowly, however, the ceremonies that symbolized fertility of soil were given another meaning, viz., a new and higher birth of the soul, so that these ancient cults preformed the way for Christianity. No Oriental worship at Rome was so popular as that of Attis and Cybele, or did so much to undermine the older Greek and Roman cult by teaching the salvation of the individual soul as the supreme end of life. Of course there are many missing links in this reconstruction, but there are also glimpses of connection with things so diverse as the story of Marsyas bound to a tree and flayed alive, probably a double of Attis. So Odin's victims, and once he himself, were hanged on a sacred tree and wounded with a spear, as Artemis was hanged in her own sacred grove. Later the Persian worship of Mithra became immensely popular at Rome, and it resembled Christianity even more, perhaps, than it did the cult of Attis, so much so that Christian scholars called it a trick of the devil to seduce people from the true fold by a close imitation of it. Its solemn ritual, too, was full of aspiration for moral purity and eternal life, and it universally fell on Christmastide instead of Easter. The Church of course accommodated, adapted, adopted, and this was at once its strength and its weakness.

Osiris was perhaps the most popular of all the deities of ancient Egypt, and his death and resurrection were annually celebrated with sorrow succeeded by joy, although this was originally only a dramatiza-

tion of seedtime and harvest. He was the son of an earth-god and a sky-goddess. He became king and gave the previously savage and cannibal Egyptians law and worship. Isis, his wife-sister, introduced the culture of wheat and barley, and made the people vegetarians, while Osiris domesticated the vine. Then both went over the world civilizing everywhere. Osiris's brother proved a usurper, and made a precious coffin for him; and on their return, when all were merry, he proposed that each should try it, which they did in turn. When Osiris lay in it, it fitted exactly, and the usurper slammed down the lid, soldered it, and flung it into the Nile. Isis wandered far, weeping and seeking the body, which had floated to Syria, where a tree shot up that entombed the coffin in its trunk, which a king cut and made a pillar in his house. Isis followed it and mourned by its side; she was accepted as a nurse in the house, and finally was given the coffin, took it home, opened it, kissed the body, mourned, and was about to revive it, but Typhon found it and tore it into fourteen parts, so that there are fourteen shrines of Osiris to-day in Egypt. Orthodox Egyptian tradition says that the grief of this dolorous mother induced the sun-god Ra to send down Anubis who gathered and swathed the scattered parts of the body, observed all the rites over them, and fanned the clayey remains with wings till at last Osiris revived and returned as king both of the upper earth and among the dead. He became Lord of Eternity, ruler of the lower regions, where he judges and rewards all souls after death according to their merits. The morality of the Egyptian Book of the Dead is very like that of Jesus, and those who are acquitted live in a land of indescribable fertility and beauty where men and animals are young and fair, and there is eternal verdure. In Osiris's resurrection the Egyptians see a pledge of their own immortality: "As surely as Osiris lives I shall live." Belief in resurrection is suggested by the custom of embalming, which was physically very like that of Osiris. Mourning for him began when the Nile began to rise. Then the dams were ceremonially cut and the soil became the bride of the Nile. Seed-sowing was in autumn, and was sad; for planting, as among primitive people to-day, suggests the burial, and is often connected with the festival of the dead. Thus representatives of potentates are often killed, dismembered, or burned to increase the fertility of the soil, so that in Egypt special precautions were taken that bodies be not cut up and their fragments used as talismans for this

purpose. Osiris was originally a tree spirit, and pillars solemnly erected to him were symbols of resurrection. Even from this so bald sketch we can glimpse the culture atmosphere which pervades so much of Christianity, and can see that not only in the regions which Jesus knew but perhaps still more in those which Paul knew and where the Church first had its development, these cults were developed in both their higher and lowest forms, and their influence was very pervasive.

Now the above death and resurrection motifs which have had such polymorphic expression, and the partial impulsions of which are so effectively syncretized into the story of the cross, express in symbolic form the most essential philosophy of human life. To understand it takes us nearest to the noetic core of the supreme problem of the nature, meaning, and purpose of human life, and to feel it with correct orientation gives the right *Einstellung* to duty and the practical conduct of life. It is just here that we are having most helpful genetic insights which may be roughly indicated somewhat as follows:

First, we must postulate that something happened very early in man's career to disturb his harmony with nature such as animals still have, and to make his life more or less anxious, conscious, and uncertain. He had to leave paradise and apply himself to the work of restoration. As himself the apex of evolution and thus the chief bearer of its highest momentum, he must transcend the animal plane and forge his way on and up with constant effort and danger both of error and arrest. On the one hand he had not only all the animal instincts, some of them perverted or hypertrophied, but he also felt the *nisus* of development beyond them and a desire for perfecting himself along with a corresponding horror of inferiority, while the strength and often the gratification of his baser propensities gave him a now vague and now acute sense of unworthiness and sin. The impulse to improve and ascend is, despite all, the most constant and deepest thing in the human soul, and out of this has grown every beneficent human institution, family, society, state, culture, and religion. Moral autonomy has been both the efficient and the final cause of all these, and to this end Mansoul has through the ages slowly evolved language, art, science, gods, demons, mythologies, rites, cults, and even consciousness itself, by the slow and costly method of trial and error, for all these are at bottom pragmatic.

In such a being every step of advance involves some sacrifice of a lower to a higher good. As birth itself brings harder conditions, so every stage of growth means renunciation of more infantile conditions. As the child is weaned, gets out of the nursery, and then the home, parental influences wane, and the time comes when he must leave all this and set up for himself. So, too, he must constantly sacrifice not only childish wishes but allurements to linger on lower stages of development and to indulge propensities which should be sublimated. Advancement is hard, but both sin and psychic disorders or arrest ensue if advance is not constantly made, for there are countless forms of arrest, which is impossible without regression. All this is on the analogy of rudimentary organs and functions which must be developed in their nascent period only to be reduced or made over into higher organs and functions later. Thus biologically, psychogenetically, and morally, men can only "rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves," and growth is always moulting the tissues and processes that illustrate this metamorphosis. One of the prime traits of savage life is that it is pervaded in every department by taboos or "Thou shalt nots." These prohibitions abound concerning food, sex, rulers, all relations of co-members of the tribe to one another, war, industry, etc., and they altogether show not only the manifold restraints but the tremendous energy with which man enforces them upon himself. Thus human life has always tended to hedge itself in by restrictions upon its freedom, which instead of facilitating have often hindered its further normal development because there were so many things in themselves proper and perhaps needful that were not permitted or were disallowed; for customs, stronger and before law, are always enforcing every such *licet aut non licet.* Psychoanalysis holds against Wundt that these rude and often disastrously perverted impulses preceded the development of deities or demons that could reward or punish, and that such beings were only projections into the objective sphere of agencies that were primarily subjective to enforce man's primal sense of what he ought or ought not to do. From the very first man felt that he should not murder, commit incest, injure the dead, chiefs, priests, or medicine men, etc., all of which are hedged in by countless taboos; and so slowly and unconsciously his creative soul evolved supernal agencies to enforce these prohibitions, and this man did because he had first of all developed an abhorrence of violating the unwritten codex or taboo

that originally worked automatically and executed itself. Thus reverence and aversion combined to restrict very many natural inclinations. But all the conflicts that thus arose were at first endopsychic, and they were given external embodiments for the sake of better *Einstellung* and because of the persistent habit of extradition of consciousness which man owes to the functioning of his senses. In neurotics every phase of these conflicts can be seen writ large. Thus there is a striking similarity in their fundamental operations between primitive men, most forms of mental alienation, children, etc., and about every mechanism found in the one is also operative in the others.

Now, whenever a strong taboo is violated, the primitive sense of guilt arises and the need of atonement is felt, so that sacrifice and offering must be made or penance done to make good the wrong act, thought, or even inclination. It is hard for us to realize the intensity of this experience in the early history of mankind, which so pervaded and dominated all his activities, his myths, rites, and primitive culture generally, all of which we are just now beginning to see were full of it. Indeed, this interpretation of the pristine sense of guilt affords us a new key to explain most of the fundamental elements of antique culture as well as many of the chief forms of modern psychosis. The savage warrior does penance to the ghosts of those he has slain, undergoes long and painful ceremonies of purification for the violation of countless and often absurd prescriptions, mutilates his body, offers his fruits, treasures, kine, and even human beings, to appease the higher powers whom he thinks he has offended. Holocausts are offered, or the penitent denies himself food, renounces the *vita sexualis*, makes over his possessions, abandons his fondest inclinations, all in order to escape a bad conscience and the intolerable anxiety it causes. Ancient legends and superstitions abound in depictions, often in very symbolic language, of this sense that the right way has been lost and of the desire to find it that the soul may rest again. Christianity has so tended to weaken this old dread of sin and its penalty that even those who have not adopted it in the technical sense that the Church demands illustrate how the long and bitter struggle to be justified by the supreme powers has so lapsed that it is hard for us to believe or realize its pristine intensity. We might even roughly say that the atoning work of Jesus has been so effective or so deeply brought home to the world during all these centuries since his death that under its influence men have even

lost sight of the pathetic state of mind of their forbears from which it has rescued them.

All dragons, serpents, vampires, and other monsters slain by heroes, and also all flagellations and self-mutilations by frenzied priests are at root symbolic expressions of the effort of man or of the gods he has made in his own image as his totemic *Doppelgänger* to sacrifice their lower animal nature or their infantile personality in the interests of their higher development, which must be done unless, as in dementia præcox, there is regression to the old subjectivity. But what is offered up always comes back in higher form, and this is resurrection. Gross love, if repressed, returns in the form of love and service of God and man. Coarse appetite for food, if restrained, revives in spiritual or mental hunger. Each lower impulse has a higher psychokinetic equivalent, the development of which is the inner meaning and moral of every planting or seed burial, and subsequent sprouting, which despite its first economic meaning which began with the very domestication of plants, soon came to be pressed into the higher service of expressing man's need of mortifying his crude lower desires that they may spring up and bear fruits in due season in the loftier psychic realm. Every expropriation of possession to the gods or their priests, every lustration or ceremonial washing, every libation of wine or of blood and flesh-burning upon altars, every offering of doves, lambs, bulls, or human victims, is in order that man may square himself or set himself right with the higher powers which are always and everywhere projections of his own conscience. Many of even his worst phobias are expressions of conscience-made cowardice. From the old Akkadian dread of the awful Maskim, the Semitic conscience slowly evolved all the rituals of purgation to propitiate conscience and expiate sin. The *mysterium Mythraicum* centred upon the same theme and approached nearest to the Christian sacraments. The Dionysian and Orphic cults and the Eleusinian mysteries were those of the death of the lower and birth into the higher life. The dying of vegetation in the fall and its revival in the spring, and even the daily setting and rising of the sun were also pressed into service as symbols of redemption from sin. All are paradigms of renunciation of a lower for the attainment of a higher end. The purpose of the old chthonian rituals (the *dacia*, *antistheria*, and the *thargelia*) was apotropic or to effect riddance, exorcism, or avoidance of evil. The novitiate who had once carried the sacred

liknon cried out, "Death is life, life is death," or, "Bad have I fled, better have I found." Where Buddhistic elements enter man conceives himself as evolving by his own merits in choosing the good and avoiding the bad through all the orders of transmigration from the lowest to the highest. Even inebriation is often a symbol of spiritual ecstasy due to the sense of having transcended the range of lower temptations.

Jesus' stupendous problem was to rid man of this awful obsession of sin, and to devise and make effective a practical psychotherapy of release and salvation. First of all there must be a new orientation as to what was really right and wrong, and this he could give only by a teaching which showed duties in their true perspective, gave a correct table of values, and replaced formal by real moral distinctions. But in addition to this there must be a removal of the sense of long-accumulated hereditary guilt and apprehensiveness. How could the pall of depressive gloom be removed so that man could feel justified and freed from the enmity of the higher powers? It was just there that Jesus, on the basis of the widespread atonement ideas and cults, found the way that it is the glory of Christianity to have opened. He would personate all the victims ever offered to propitiate the gods; would be the totemic embodiment of all the first-fruits, gifts, animals, captives or kings, real or fictive, ever slain for remission; would take upon himself all the wounds, stuprations, and tortures of body or soul ever inflicted upon men by themselves or others, in order to placate wrath or even the scales of justice. He would be not a reluctant but a glad and voluntary victim, surrendering, as few of even human victims had done, the very will to live itself, choosing freely the most painful and disgraceful death, renouncing even the hope of a future life, and feeling forsaken and accursed of God and man, in a word, dying a death more pathetic than any had ever died before, dooming himself, if need be, to utter extinction or to eternal torment as heaven willed, by an act of supreme self-immolation. Moreover, his perfect innocence and abounding virtue made this supreme sacrifice still more complete and ideally perfect. Thus he underwent every possible punishment and suffered every penalty at once, as if he were the incarnation of every possible vice, crime, or sin. The best suffered the worst in the acme of injustice. All the accumulated wrath of the higher powers was concentrated and vented upon the paragon of human virtue and perfection. Only by the conception and the objective and dramatic representation of a

perfect and also a totemic paragon of humanity, invested with the supreme aura of divinity, *honoris causa*, brought from the heights of heaven to the depths of hell, could man be made to feel that the accumulated wrath augmented by sin ever since the fall was at last completely discharged, and that the higher powers could henceforth be conceived as innocuous and man as immune from the curse of guilt under which he had cowered. The long tragedy that began in the council of heaven when the Son determined to go down to earth to take on the form of man, and which culminated at Golgotha and in the tomb, showed in the most appalling way, once and for all, what God thought and felt about sin, because he both required such a victim and had so completely accepted and overwhelmed it. The age-long complex of guilt and fear was here fully brought up into consciousness, and by being objectified was thereby made evictable, so that the cure of the obsession was brought within man's reach. The sense of sin and atonement are like all-pervasive chemical elements which because of their intense affinities are hard to isolate, but which are here for a moment seen in their free, pure, nascent state, as moral elements that pervade all human experience.

What now remains for man to do is to realize that the whole process is endopsychic; that it is at root an autosoteriological process; that the great tragedy is not an outer spectacle, but a symbolization of an inner process of self-katharsis which Mansoul has achieved; that pity for Jesus' agonies is really self-pity; and that "the suffering servant" of Yahveh is in very fact and truth man himself, whose release is really achieved only when he repeats the act of self-purgation in himself. Only because of man's persistent ejective habit of thought is it hard to realize that it is all only a projection into the field of history of an internal process, and that the precious symbols of ransom and vicarious atonement are necessary, and that man has been so persistently prone to think himself saved from without by the imputation of an alien righteousness.

Again, the psychology of anger shows that when it has flamed forth with abandon, and especially toward an innocent and lovable being, it is followed by an ambivalent wave of pity and perhaps love. The tragedy of Calvary makes man impute the same process to the soul of God, so that a new dispensation of benignity succeeds that of wrath and punishment, as if the mind of the divine being had been converted to a new attitude toward man. This means that sympathetic par-

ticipation in the story of the cross brings a new attitude of man toward himself. He has evicted the old dread, and in so doing his own soul is resurrected. The real Resurrection thus is not an achievement of Jesus. But what man has done for his ideal self, symbolized objectively by the Resurrection, he has ascribed to Jesus, now inwardly seen to be his own *alter ego* and the ideal renouncer of all regressive tendencies. Eucharistic bread and wine, the baptism, all survivals of the old and world-wide blood covenants and *haoma* cults, and all the copious imagery of Paul and of the Fourth Gospel touching incorporation and identification with Jesus, are precious rituals, symbols, and types of the psychologic fact that Jesus is in very truth the incarnation of man's better self, purified of sin, and that Jesus' Resurrection is not a *fait accompli* but a perennial duty of all believers. All these rites thus are so many invocations to resubjectify the processes of salvation.[1]

All that is of value in human life strikes its roots deep into our instinctive nature, and what rises highest has the deepest and oldest roots. This shows the need of constant transformation of all that is best in us into ever-higher and more sublimated forms. There must be incessant new adjustments and finer adaptations. Sin is failure to hold to new insights and ideas, and this causes uncertainty and failure of the power to put them to work. Failure to make these most-needed readjustments brings a sense of anxiety closely allied to guilt, into which it easily passes over, and misfortune often arouses or deepens a sense of guilt. In this tense state the soul sometimes yields to and carries out some base impulsion, and this arouses into action the next higher power that controls the impulse, so that such lapses may issue in the renunciation of the base tendency. This is, however, a dangerous way of making sin abound that grace may the more abound, and we think of the great sinners who have been saved by a great salvation. In the struggle to be released from the body of death, the soul for whom these processes are objectified projects into God his own wish to punish, and expects him to avenge what he would, but cannot. It is just the sins we are inclined to that we are most anxious for him to punish. The vindictive God thus expresses man's sometimes almost Sadistic rage against his own faults. In his reprobation of sin we mirror our own abhorrence of it. Thus we are both punisher and victim. Again, we

[1]See J. C. Goetz: "Die Abendmahlsfrage in ihrer geschichtliche Entwicklung," Leipzig, 1904, 311 pp.; also, Herman Schultze: "Zur Lehrer der heiligen Abendmahl," 1886; also Schweitzer: "Der Abendmahl," 1901. See, too, Ullmann's "The Sinlessness of Jesus"; also Bartel's "Die Medizin der Naturvölker," Leipzig, 1903; and Peters' "Aus pharmazeutischer Vorzeit," 1886.

may wreak vengeance upon innocent objects by transfer, when we are really wroth only at ourselves. Thus the guilty conscience makes scapegoats or vicariates for its own ill deserts. All offerings to the gods are not only self-penalizations, because they involve sacrifice of personal or communal goods, which are expropriated, but we feel and express our resentment in the obloquy and cruelty we mete out to the proxy of our sins. Thus Mansoul is bifrontic. Man punishes himself, and Paul was logical in inferring that if, as the whole Hebrew scheme of sacrifice implied, guilt and punishment could be transferred, merit could also be transferred. So, too, the sinlessness of Jesus meant that man felt that there was a bottom core of goodness in his own nature beneath all the guilt, and that when all its guilt and sin had been purged away and atoned, this would shine forth as if resurrected from the dead. Thus Paul's theory of vicariousness was after all a concession to the hardness of men's hearts and the blindness of their minds, because Jesus is at bottom not a substitute. He is in very deed ipsissimal man himself, and all that happened or was done for the one was also done for the other. Thus Jesus' fate was only an allegory of what really transpires in every soul that becomes regenerate and finds again the lost trail. The sarcous man dies, and the pneumatic man arises in his place, reformed, reoriented, and reconstellated.

For long evolutionary ages, probably since the troglodytes, the chief fact in the psychic history of man was his uncertainty and fear concerning his own place in the universe. Long and hard had been his struggle for survival with the formidable animal forms that would not recognize him as lord of creation. Nature visited him also with storm, flood, drouth, famine, disease; the fruits of the earth were uncertain; enemies lurked about; and instead of being in a lawful cosmos his ignorance made his world full of mysterious and capricious forces which were really of his own creation, so that his mind was saturated with superstitious dreads. He must be incessantly circumspect, and every calamity that befell him, even death, was due to his own fault, and very likely was the retributive act of invisible personalities. Perhaps he felt that his predecessors had offended; but certainly he felt that he had, and that he was constantly liable to offend the powers that shaped his fate. We probably have in the analyses of neuroses with compulsive ideas a very good survival of this old savage conception of sin and its dangers, and ways to avoid it. Now nothing is so provoca-

tive of projection as this sense of guilt. Evil must be extradited, and so, as Wundt shows, bad demons were projected before the benign gods, and it needed but little secondary working over of these outward expressions of this conflict in his own soul to develop and establish the conception of a dual world ruled by two groups of powers, one friendly and the other hostile. When this was done the unconscious processes in man's soul became more accessible, and instead of imperative psychoses there were commands or prohibitions from without to check, and some to facilitate, the expression of man's impulses. Symbols and dreams although these powers were, they were very efficient for control. That man did not, however, entirely resign the control of himself to his gods is seen by the belief in the omnipotence of his own thought or wish, traces of which we can still see in infancy, but which have their chief illustration in magic, by which man directs the action of gods. If he had forgotten that the supernal powers were made, warp and woof, out of his own soul-stuff, and had never begun to realize how solipsistic he had been, and never consciously said "All this transcendental universe, it is I," he nevertheless drew the pragmatic moral of this fact in the belief that by manifold and fit spells, incantations, and later by rites, ceremonies, and prayers, he could constrain the high powers.

Very slowly, particularly in the Hebrew consciousness and in the patriarchal age, the concepts of good as over against bad powers had been fused together in one unitary, monotheistic idea, fashioned on the pattern of the father and headsman of the pastoral tribe, who was both loved and dreaded with the same feelings which psychoanalysis shows younger children still have toward their father. All sin was against the God-father, and when the flesh-and-blood head of the clan died or was slain (his slaughter being perhaps the primal sin in the world), whatever of this God-idea remained was attached to the father surrogate, totemism began, and religion began to consist in identification with the totem by blood covenants, by commensal eating, and in sublimation by fire, in burnt offerings and incense, with increasing refinement as the God-idea grew and withdrew.[1]

[1]To which we might apply the language of Ariel in Shakespeare's Tempest:

"Full fathom five thy father lies,
Of his bones are coral made:
Those are pearls that were his eyes,
Nothing of him that doth fade,
But doth suffer a sea-change
Into something rich, and strange."

Thus, when Jesus, the perfect totemic man, offered himself up voluntarily as a sacrifice and was accepted and allowed to die as a victim, the old kingdom of law became bankrupt. It had utterly and hopelessly failed. The Yahveh of the priests and Levites was dead. Like the Titans, he had devoured his own offspring, and the tragedy of Golgotha was his funeral. He was slain by the rigorous execution of his own law. He had long been an obsession from which man was now at last released. Jesus' death had also been the death of the Ur-Father. He would no longer exact to the uttermost farthing of the letter or take his pound of flesh. His whole disposition had suffered a *reductio ad absurdum*,[1] and there was no further *raison d'être* for him, although we see only the ambivalent side of Jesus' reverence and filial devotion to him, for this apparently was all that came into Jesus' own consciousness. It was this tendency to cover up the slaughter of the old God which was seized upon and greatly exaggerated, especially by Paul and the author of the Fourth Gospel, who could never conceive Jesus as a noble parricide who with super-Promethean defiance had challenged and slain the Deity of the temple and the law. As Theseus slew the Minotaur, Siegfried and Saint George the dragon, so Jesus had overcome the antiquated and cruel guardian and executor of the law, and thereby released man from his age-long sense of accumulated guilt and the haunting dread of unworthiness that it had become the chief function of Yahveh as well as of all his psychogenetic predecessors in other races, back to the first malign demons, to inculcate. It was a supreme act of genius to detect his vulnerable point, of strategy to find how to reach it, and of devotion to inflict the *coup de grâce*. Originally a combination, as we saw, of the good and bad powers that ruled human life into a unipersonal form, Yahveh thus had degenerated from his golden age into a predominantly malign being, fully ripe for execution. Jesus' method of accomplishing this result by drawing all the venom out of Yahveh upon his own innocent self, so that both died together, was perhaps the supreme achievement of the human soul, so that Jesus' Resurrection and exaltation to Supreme Deity afterward is a monument that humanity had to rear to this great act of deliverance. Thus the concurrent *Einfühlung*, which is in

[1] F. Riklin: "Betrachtung zur kritischen Passionsgeschichte," in "Wissen und Leben," Zurich, 1913. C. G. Jung: "The Psychology of the Unconscious," 1916, 566 pp. J. E. Harrison: "Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion," 1903, 680 pp., J. G. Frazer: "The Golden Bough," London, 1907-15, 12 vol. S. Freud: "Totem und Tabu," 1913, 149 pp. Wm. Ramsay Smith: "Lectures on the Religion of the Semites," New York, 1889, 488 pp.

fact the supreme test of the real actual existence of any person, vouches even more strongly for the factuality of the risen Jesus than it does for the Jesus of Galilee and Gethsemane, and all the admirable and scholarly argumentation of men like Lake, that bases belief in the risen Jesus upon the evidence of the empty tomb, must tend to divert us from the chief psychodynamic evidence on which we must mainly depend for the affirmation of that without which "our faith is vain." Indeed, at this distance and henceforth increasingly and forever, the chief basis of our belief in the superhistorical reality of Jesus is that the folk-soul being what it is, he had to rise.

On the one hand, although Yahveh had degenerated far toward ethical dotage, as compared with the conceptions of him held in the classic age of prophecy, and had become vindictive and petty, with much of the ceremonial punctilio of senescence, it could never be forgotten that although he was ripe for death, because there was more harm than good left in him, he was still, although defunct, the Lord of the old covenant and of precious memories. Hence, as if dimly realizing the patricidal attitude and act to which fate had destined him with respect to the God of the Jewish orthodoxy of his day, Jesus had no disposition to degrade Yahveh to the position of an ex-God or to diabolize him, for Jesus was no usurping aspirer for Godhood by displacing a predecessor, as all new gods had done before. But by the laws of ambivalence and compensation the better elements of Yahveh's nature were not only conserved but, now that he was gone, given a loftier and far more attractive interpretation than ever before. Thus, along with the accession of Jesus to plenary Deity, not only had the better side of the God-father idea been conserved but Yahveh might in a sense be said to have been converted to a new benignity. He was again humanized, refined, and exalted. Thus God and man were each atoned, and the God-idea as well as Jesus was resurrected from the dead in transfigured form. This was the great reconciliation. Thus the inmost soul of the race was revealed and spoke as never before or since. The last dreary and ominous word of the Old Testament with which the old dispensation closed was a threat which Malachi puts into Yahveh's mouth "to come and smite the earth with a curse." But this empire of fear was over, and God in Christ had reconciled man to himself in the new liberty of the sons of God. To all

who will love and serve God and God in man, the old era, therefore, of dread, and the incessant and interminable sacrifice which began, perhaps, with the very first and lowest man and was world-wide, was over. Thus in raising Jesus from the dead Mansoul raised both God and itself, and entered a new world as a new creature.

THE END



THE COUNTRY LIFE PRESS
GARDEN CITY, N. Y.

Date Due

MR 22 '48

BS2421 .H17 v.2
Jesus, the Christ, in the light of
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00013 1617